CANADIAN THESES ON MICROFICHE

THÈSES CANADIENNES SUR MICROFICHE

National Library of Canada
Collections Development Branch

Canadian Theses on
Microfiche Service

Ottawa, Canada
K1A 0N4

Bibliothèque nationale du Canada
Direction du développement des collections

Service des thèses canadiennes
sur microfiche

NOTICE

The quality of this microfiche is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original thesis submitted for microfilming. Every effort has been made to ensure the highest quality of reproduction possible.

If pages are missing, contact the university which granted the degree.

Some pages may have indistinct print especially if the original pages were typed with a poor typewriter ribbon or if the university sent us an inferior photocopy.

Previously copyrighted materials (journal articles, published tests, etc.) are not filmed.

Reproduction in full or in part of this film is governed by the Canadian Copyright Act, R.S.C. 1970, c. C-30. Please read the authorization forms which accompany this thesis.

AVIS

La qualité de cette microfiche dépend grandement de la qualité de la thèse soumise au microfilmage. Nous avons tout fait pour assurer une qualité supérieure de reproduction.

S'il manque des pages, veuillez communiquer avec l'université qui a conféré le grade.

La qualité d'impression de certaines pages peut laisser à désirer, surtout si les pages originales ont été dactylographiées à l'aide d'un ruban usé ou si l'université nous a fait parvenir une photocopie de qualité inférieure.

Les documents qui font déjà l'objet d'un droit d'auteur (articles de revue, examens publiés, etc.) ne sont pas microfilmés.

La reproduction, même partielle, de ce microfilm est soumise à la Loi canadienne sur le droit d'auteur, SRC 1970, c. C-30. Veuillez prendre connaissance des formules d'autorisation qui accompagnent cette thèse.

THIS DISSERTATION
HAS BEEN MICROFILMED
EXACTLY AS RECEIVED

LA THÈSE A ÉTÉ
MICROFILMÉE TELLE QUE
NOUS L'AVONS REÇUE

NL 339 (r. 85/09)

Canada

National Library of Canada
Ottawa, Canada
K1A 0N4

Bibliothèque nationale du Canada

91

TC –	67344
ISBN	0-315-19436-7

CANADIAN THESES ON MICROFICHE SERVICE – SERVICE DES THÈSES CANADIENNES SUR MICROFICHE

PERMISION TO MICROFILM – AUTORISATION DE MICROFILMER

• Please print or type – Écrire en lettres moulées ou dactylographier

AUTHOR – AUTEUR

Full Name of Author – Nom complet de l'auteur
Janis Craig McMurchy Dawson

Date of Birth – Date de naissance 17 November 1951	Canadian Citizen – Citoyen canadien ☑ Yes / Oui ☐ No / Non
Country of Birth – Lieu de naissance Canada	Permanent Address – Résidence fixe 10208 Brookpark Blvd. S.W Calgary, Alberta T2W.2P7

THESIS – THÈSE

Title of Thesis – Titre de la thèse
The Image of the Family in English Didactic Children's Literature 1815-1837

Degree for which thesis was presented Grade pour lequel cette thèse fut présentée PhD	Year this degree conferred Année d'obtention de ce grade 1985
University – Université University of Alberta	Name of Supervisor – Nom du directeur de thèse Dr. Peter J. Miller

AUTHORIZATION – AUTORISATION

Permission is hereby granted to the NATIONAL LIBRARY OF CANADA to **microfilm** this thesis and to **lend** or **sell copies of the film.**

The author reserves other publication rights, and neither the thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's written permission.

L'autorisation est, par la présente, accordée à la BIBLIOTHÈQUE NATIONALE DU CANADA de **microfilmer** cette thèse et de **prêter** ou de **vendre des exemplaires du film.**

L'auteur se réserve les autres droits de publication; ni la thèse ni de longs extraits de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans l'autorisation écrite de l'auteur.

ATTACH FORM TO THESIS – VEUILLEZ JOINDRE CE FORMULAIRE À LA THÈSE

Signature Janis Dawson	Date 26 March 1985

NL-91 (r. 84/03)

Canada

THE IMAGE OF THE FAMILY IN ENGLISH DIDACTIC CHILDREN'S LITERATURE 1815 - 1837

by

© JANIS CRAIG McMURCHY DAWSON

A THESIS
SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH
IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE
OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY
IN
HISTORY OF EDUCATION

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL FOUNDATIONS

EDMONTON, ALBERTA
SPRING, 1985

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

RELEASE FORM

JANIS CRAIG MCMURCHY DAWSON

THE IMAGE OF THE FAMILY IN ENGLISH DIDACTIC CHILDREN'S LITERATURE 1815 - 1837

DEGREE FOR WHICH THESIS WAS PRESENTED:
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

YEAR THIS DEGREE GRANTED:
1985

Permission is hereby granted to THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA LIBRARY to reproduce single copies of this thesis and to lend or sell such copies for private, scholarly or scientific research purposes only.

The author reserves other publication rights, and neither the thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's written permission.

Janis Craig McMurchy Dawson

Janis Craig McMurchy Dawson

PERMANENT ADDRESS:
10208 - Brookpark Blvd., SW
Calgary, Alberta
T2W 2P7

DATED 26 March 1985

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

The undersigned certify that they have read, and recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research, for acceptance, a thesis entitled The Image of the Family in English Didactic Children's Literature 1815 - 1837 submitted by Janis Craig McMurchy Dawson in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in History of Education.

....
Supervisor

Gerald Redmond
....

D. R. Pugh
....

R. J. Carney
....

S. W. Jackman
....
External Examiner

Date 23rd January 95

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this thesis is to contribute to an understanding of the family in the past through an examination of the image of the family presented in didactic children's literature published in England between 1815 and 1837. A consideration of the extent to which this image conforms or does not conform to generally held interpretations of the history of the family is a secondary goal of the thesis. A representative sample of one hundred books and stories selected from the Osborne Collection of Early Children's Books in Toronto formed the primary source material for the study.

A combined qualitative-quantitative approach is used in the examination of the books. The books are examined individually in terms of a number of questions grouped into four topics considered pertinent to a study of the family. The topics are in turn developed into four thesis chapters: The Structural Features of the Family and Household Composition; Internal Relationships; The Relationship between the Family, the Household, and the Community; and The Family and Education and Recreation.

Throughout the thesis, the image of the family as presented in the didactic literature is considered in relation to other literary sources and current interpretations of the history of the family.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to express my gratitude to my supervisor, Dr. P. J. Miller, for his patience and guidance during the preparation of my thesis and throughout my program. I also wish to thank Dr. G. Redmond and Professor D. R. Pugh for their advice and assistance. The Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada provided generous financial support from 1979 to 1982.

A special acknowledgement is also due to the staff of the Osborne Collection of Early Children's Books in Toronto. Their friendliness and professional assistance were much appreciated.

For the love and encouragement of my husband and my family, I am forever grateful.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter
I. INTRODUCTION 1

  Notes 32

II. STRUCTURAL FEATURES OF THE FAMILY AND HOUSEHOLD COMPOSITION 36

  I. Introduction 37
  II. Social Class and Occupation 39
  III. The Family Residence 46
    1. The Location of the Residence . . 46
    2. The House 49
    3. Household Furnishings and Housekeeping 56
    4. The Garden 59
  IV. The Family 62
    1. Parents 62
    2. Children 70
    3. Relatives 76
  V. The Household 79
    1. Unrelated Adults and Children . . 79
    2. Servants 80
    3. Governesses, Tutors, and Nurses . 82
    4. Pets 88
    5. Household Size 90
  VI. Conclusion 92
  Notes 94

III. INTERNAL RELATIONSHIPS 98

  I. Introduction 99
  II. The Center of Authority and Influence . 103
  III. Husband-Wife Relationships 107
  IV. Parent-Child Relationships 117
    1. Parental Types 117
    2. Parent-Child Relationships 134
    3. Adult-Child Relationships 145
    4. Discipline 146
      i. The Dispensation of Rewards and Punishments 146
      ii. Methods of Discipline . . . 148
  V. Sibling Relationships 171

Chapter
VI. Conclusion 183
    1. Preamble 183
    2. The Family in Nineteenth Century England 184
Notes 202

IV. THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE FAMILY, THE HOUSEHOLD, AND THE COMMUNITY 222

I. Introduction 223
II. The Economic Relationship 227
    1. The Location and Occupation of the Family Residence 227
    2. The Location of Employment 231
    3. The Economic Relationship of the Household to the Community . . . 236
III. The Social and Cultural Relationship Between the Family, the Household, and the Community 240
    1. Introduction 240
    2. Family Involvement in Community Social Activities 241
    3. Family Involvement in Community Social Work 249
    4. Other Forms of Social Interaction. 271
        i. Degree of Contact Between the Household and Neighbors 272
        ii. The Origin of Visitors to the Household 275
        iii. The Origin of Household Servants 276
    5. The Location of the Children's Schooling 277
    6. The Children's Primary Place of Recreation 282
    7. Family Interaction with Different Social Classes 285
IV. The Religious Relationship Between the Family, the Household, and the Community 287
    1. The Religious Denomination of the Family 287
    2. Sunday Worship 290
    3. Attitudes Toward Other Religious Denominations 292
V. Conclusion 296
Notes 302

V. EDUCATION AND RECREATION 312
I. Introduction 313
II. Education 314
    1. Introduction 314
    2. The Age Lessons Begin 316

Chapter

3. Type and Location of Education . . 319
4. Educational Orientation 331
5. Curriculum and Method 337
III. Recreation 375
1. Introduction 375
2. Children's Place of Recreation and Choice of Playmates 376
3. Children's Recreational Activities 379
4. Approved Reading Material for Children 391
5. Degree of Adult Involvement in Children's Recreation 399
6. Degree of Adult Supervision of Children's Recreation 403
7. Adult Recreational Activities . . 408
8. Adult Reading Material 410
IV. Conclusion 415
Notes 421

VI. CONCLUSION 438

I. Introduction 439
II. Summary and Discussion 443
Notes 462

BIBLIOGRAPHY 465

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Description	Page
1	Occupation of Fathers	42
2	Location of Households	48
3	Adult Mortality Rates	63
4	Age of Parents	69
5	Number of Families Sharing Household with Kin	78
6	Nurses, Tutors, and Governesses Employed in Fictional Families	87
7	The Relationship Between Social Class and Philanthropic Activity	261
8	Family Interaction with Different Social Classes	286
9	Popularity of Subjects in the Curriculum	340
10	Virtues and Vices Expressed in the Literature	355
11	Children's Choice of Playmates	377
12	Children's Recreational Activities--Games, Toys, Pastimes, Hobbies	381
13	Approved Reading Material for Children	393
14	Approved Reading Material for Boys	395
15	Approved Reading Material for Girls	395
16	Degree of Adult Involvement in Children's Play	404
17	Degree of Adult Supervision of Children's Play	407
18	Adult Reading Material	412
19	The Relationship Between Adult Reading Material and Social Class	413

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this thesis is to contribute to an understanding of the family in the past. The word, "contribute," must be emphasized, because the scope of this thesis is strictly limited. It concentrates on the English family at a very specific period of time--1815-1837. Its data base is also limited. The primary source material consists of didactic stories written or published for children during this twenty-two year period. This literature will be closely examined to determine the image of the family presented to English children. A consideration of the extent to which this image conforms or does not conform to generally accepted interpretations of family history will be a secondary goal of this thesis.

Interest in the history of the family has been growing steadily since the 1960's. The field has been complemented by a concurrent interest in women's history and the history of childhood. To quote James Milden, the author of _The Family in the Past Time. A Guide to the Literature_:

> Family history was reborn in the 1960's. Apart from several studies written by early twentieth century sociologists tracing the progressive evolution of the family as an institution, a handful of popular accounts, and individual genealogies of eminent or powerful families, scholars have generally ignored the family in history, its interaction with the social

> order, and its transformation through time. But the 1960's witnessed an unprecedented upsurge of interest in the history of the family. Academic circles have now recognized family studies as a significant mode of historical, psychological, and sociological inquiry. Not only have courses dealing with family history sprung up upon many college campuses, but on the popular level as well genealogy has become one of the nation's most pursued hobbies, and publications dealing with the history of the family have multiplied severalfold during the last decade.[1]

This field of study has produced its own "classic" works which are much quoted by students and scholars alike. One such work is Centuries of Childhood by Philippe Ariès. Originally published in 1960 under the title, L'Enfant et la vie familiale sous l'ancien régime, this book is generally regarded as a great pioneering work and it may indeed have sparked that "unprecedented upsurge of interest in the history of the family" noted by Milden. Lawrence Stone, a scholar who has himself made important contributions to family history, notes the book's "dazzling success" and its "seminal brilliance":

> /It/...has been the primum mobile of the study of family history in the last decade. As a pioneer work, erudite, imaginative, and inventive, it deserves all the praise and attention it has received. It is the kind of path-breaking book no traditional historian could have written, and without it our culture would be the poorer.[2]

The importance and pervasiveness of Ariès's interpretation of the history of the family demands a discussion of his work, particularly since the majority of works which have followed have either incorporated his ideas or reacted violently against them.

One of the factors which prompted Ariès to undertake the research which resulted in Centuries of Childhood was his interest in Medieval and Renaissance paintings of children. The sober, stiff little creatures, dressed as adults and identifiable as children by their small size alone, caught his imagination. It seemed to him that this inability to depict children as children reflected a lack of awareness, an ignorance of childhood. He wondered what family life must have been like for them at this time.

As a demographic historian, Ariès was deeply interested in family history. His dissatisfaction with current theories of the evolution and history of the family prompted him to try to determine the origin of the idea of the family.[3] Here his interest in art and his interest in family studies converged. Because he believed there was a connection between the idea of childhood and the idea of the family, he began to search for the origin of both ideas simultaneously.

Ariès divides his book into three parts: "The Idea of Childhood," "Scholastic Life," and "The Family." In "The Idea of Childhood," he states that Medieval society was lacking "an awareness of the particular nature of childhood, that particular nature which distinguishes the child from the adult, even the young adult."[4] But by the sixteenth or seventeenth century, a definite change had taken place in the general attitude toward children, at least in the upper classes of society. The paintings of the period show that children and infants now had special costumes which distinguished them from adults. Their physical features now marked them as children. "A new concept of childhood had appeared," he states, "in which the child, on account of his sweetness, simplicity, and drollery, became a source of amusement and relaxation for the adult."[5] Ariès notes the growth of an interest in child psychology. The number of treatises published on education, health, hygiene, and infant nurture is proof of the growing awareness of and concern with childhood at this time.

In his discussion of the scholastic life, Ariès outlines the developments in educational thought and practice from the Middle Ages to the eighteenth century. He notes once more a growing awareness of childhood from the time when children of all ages were educated indifferently with adults, with no special attention given to the tenderness of age or ability, to the time when children were segregated from adults, age graded, and given special attention. He notes adult concern with the development of the child's mind, the growing adult preoccupation with preserving childhood purity and innocence from adult corruption, the concern with control and discipline, and the great proliferation of educational theories, teaching methods, and schools in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. A lack of awareness of childhood passed into an overawareness, a preoccupation with childhood. This preoccupation with childhood, Ariès argues, has led to a prolongation of childhood--with questionable benefits.

In his discussion of the family, Ariès notes the same lack of awareness in the Medieval past of the family as something particular, part of and yet not part of society. He writes:

> The historian who studies iconographic documents in the hope of discovering the tremor of life which he can feel in his own existence, is surprised at the scarcity, at least until the sixteenth century, of interior and family scenes....For a long time, until the seventeenth century, when the iconography of the family became extremely rich--the important thing was the representation of public life. This representation doubtless corresponds to a profound reality. Life in the past, until the seventeenth century, was lived in public.[6]

Ariès argues, on the basis of iconography, that the concept of the family was unknown in the Middle Ages. He states that "it originated in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries and...reached its full expression in the seventeenth century."[7] Kinship and the concept of lineage or "the line" was important in the Middle Ages, however, and Ariès concedes:

> One might say that the concept of the line was the only concept of a family character known to the Middle Ages. It was very different from the concept of the family such as we have seen it in the iconography of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. It extended to the ties of blood without regard to the emotions engendered by cohabitation and intimacy.[8]

Through a process that was both gradual and deliberately initiated by the church and the state, the authority of the husband and father in the home was increased; the wife and children were made subject to his authority. The wife lost what position of influence she once held in the lineage system, as well as her ability to appeal to her kin in distress. By the seventeenth century, "a value was attributed to the family which had previously been attributed to the line. It became the social cell, the basis of the State, the foundation of the Monarchy."[9] Ties of affection, intimacy, and duty bound family members tightly to one another. Increasing emphasis was placed on "sentiment." There was increasing nucleation of the family, a cutting off from the community. Privacy became increasingly important. In the Medieval past, there was, it seems, no concept of privacy. Domestic dwellings as well as conditions of life did not permit privacy. By the seventeenth century, however, many of the houses of those who could pay, were being built or remodelled along lines that put the desire for privacy foremost. Such innovations consisted of the construction of specialized rooms, corridors that passed outside of rooms instead of through them, and the creation of separate living and sleeping quarters for the servants.

This concept of the family that emerged by the seventeenth century was formed around the conjugal or nuclear family, that of the parents and children. As Ariès writes:

> This concept is closely linked to that of childhood. It has less and less to do with problems such as the honour of a line, the integrity of an inheritance, or the age and permanence of a name: it springs simply from the unique relationship between the parents and their children....As the attitude towards the child changed, so did the family itself.[10]

Ariès, then, links the idea of childhood with the idea of the family. He sees their development as a concurrent growth. It is important to note that Ariès regrets the decline of the old sociability which seemed to be incompatible with the growth of the concept of the family.[11] The nuclear family as it has developed, craving privacy and intimacy, binding its members together by tight emotional ties, its energies focused obsessively on "the physical, moral, and sexual problems of childhood," has become what Ariès refers to as "a prison of love."[13]

For all its brilliance, Centuries of Childhood is not without flaws, some of them serious. Stone and others have noted problems in Ariès's methodology and conclusions. Barbara Harris, referring to the book as a "masterpiece," complains that it is "marked by the vaguest and most confusing references to chronology."[14] Yet, as she states, "In spite of the fact that his book has been subjected to all sorts of criticism, his central thesis about the evolution of family structure and relationships among the French upper classes is widely accepted."[15]

Ariès's main focus is on French social history, but he does not restrict himself to France in his search for evidence. This does create problems of interpretation and makes some of his conclusions suspect. Stone soundly criticizes Ariès on this point, and emphasizes that geography clearly matters.[16] It is not safe to generalize too freely from one society to another. Yet perhaps it is this characteristic of Ariès's work that has made it so popular and so widely used and accepted. Because he ranges so casually all over western Europe and Britain, and even makes a foray into the Moslem world in search of evidence, his ideas, if not his entire model have seemed applicable to histories of the family throughout the western world, including North America.

Standing in almost belligerent opposition to Ariès's Centuries of Childhood is Lloyd deMause's lengthy essay, "The Evolution of Childhood" (1974). Ariès's book, deMause flatly states, is unreliable. He criticizes Ariès's concept of the "invention of childhood" (a phrase which appears in deMause's work rather than in Ariès's), and Ariès's belief in the happy and unrestrained mixing of children and adults in the past. DeMause writes:

> Ariès's central thesis is the opposite of mine: he argues that while the traditional child was happy because he was free to mix with many classes and ages, a special condition known as childhood was "invented" in the early modern period, resulting in a tyrannical concept of the family which destroyed friendship and sociability and deprived children of freedom, inflicting upon them for the first time the birch and the prison cell.[17]

DeMause also criticizes Ariès's discussion of Medieval painting, particularly Ariès's statement that "in the tenth century artists were unable to depict a child except as a man on a smaller scale"[18] and that "Medieval art until about the twelfth century did not know childhood or attempt to portray it."[19] "Not only does this leave the art of antiquity in limbo," deMause writes, "but it ignores the voluminous evidence that medieval artists could, indeed, paint realistic children."[20] Finally, deMause maintains that Ariès's argument, "that the modern family restricts the child's freedom and increases the severity of punishment runs counter to all evidence."[21]

A critique of deMause's criticism of Ariès is not intended here, but it should be noted that deMause's interpretation of Ariès's work is definitely his own, and it seems to be set up as a foil for his own interpretation of the history of childhood and family. DeMause's interpretation emphasizes the extreme brutality which children suffered at the hands of adults in the past.

Prefacing his essay with lines from Elizabeth Barrett Browning's poem, "The Cry of the Children," deMause begins:

> The history of childhood is a nightmare from which we have only recently begun to awaken. The further back in history one goes, the lower the level of child care, and the more likely children are to be killed, abandoned, beaten, terrorized, and sexually abused.[22]

"The Evolution of Childhood" is a lengthy exposé of crimes perpetrated on children by adults. His emphasis is on the spectacular, rather than the commonplace. DeMause's approach differs radically from that of Ariès who tries to take into account social and cultural developments in his interpretation of the history of childhood and the family. DeMause maintains that:

> The major dynamic in historical change is ultimately neither technology or economics. More important are the changes in personality that grow from differences between generations in the quality of the relationships between parent and child.[23]

According to deMause, interest in child nurture and child development and growth of affection for children cause advances in medical knowledge, changes in the concept of the family, developments in philosophy, theology, and political thought. All is focused on parenting:

> Good parenting is something that has been achieved only after centuries as generation after generation of parents tried to overcome the abuse of their own childhoods by reaching out to their children on more mature levels of relating.[24]

DeMause does not see the Medieval past nostalgically as a time of free and easy sociability among friends, neighbours, and kin of all ages. He sees it rather as a time of grim and terrible abuse of children. He does not regret the prolongation of childhood as Ariès does, nor does he regard the modern family as a prison of love. He sees the modern family in a much more optimistic light, moving into the highest stage of its evolution. The modern family in this stage, practicing the helping mode of child-rearing, is humane and child-centered. The child himself is deemed to know better than his parents what he needs at each stage of his life, and his parents devote themselves to helping the child with his expanding needs.

DeMause's starting point in history is antiquity rather than the Middle Ages. He moves in a linear evolutionary path to the present day, tracing the history of parent-child relations through six modes: the infanticidal (Antiquity), the abandonment (Medieval), the ambivalent (Renaissance), the intrusive (eighteenth century), the socializing (nineteenth century to the present), and the helping mode (just beginning). Movement through these modes is determined by parent-child relationships. As deMause explains:

> Throughout history, an adult has had three major reactions to a child who needs its care. The projective reaction consists of using the child for a receptacle for the adult's unconscious feelings. The reversal reaction occurs when the adult uses the child as a substitute for an adult figure who was important in his own childhood. The empathic reaction, a late historical acquisition, occurs if the adult is able to empathize with and satisfy the child's needs. The first two reactions occurred simultaneously in parents in the past, producing a strange double image of the child in which it was at once both bad (projective) and needed (reversal). The further back in history you look, the more evident are these reactions and the more bizarre the prevailing attitudes toward children.[25]

As a means of explaining current incidents of child abuse, deMause does emphasize that "functional equivalents of earlier modes remain with us," and that there are parents "who behave like evolutionary arrests, psychological fossils stuck in personality modes from a previous historical period, when most parents used to batter children."[26]

"The Evolution of Childhood" is a neo-Freudian interpretation of history. To quote deMause:

> Because psychic structure is passed from generation to generation through the narrow gap of childhood, the child-rearing practices of a society are more than just another item on a list of cultural traits. The history of childhood in fact determines which elements in all the rest of history will be transmitted and which will be changed. By studying the history of childhood we can gain an understanding of the personality traits on which our adult society rests....[27]

Psychohistory, as deMause's particular version of history is known, has enraged many more conventional, traditional historians. His methodology is probably even more open to criticism than Ariès's. For example, his treatment of sources is far more casual and indiscriminate than that of Ariès. Yet deMause's ideas have been used by conventional historians such as Lawrence Stone in his study of the English family between 1500 and 1800.[28] Many historians of the family have been particularly interested in deMause's modes. The applicability of some of these modes to the subject matter of this thesis will be considered at a later point.

The interpretations of Ariès and deMause have greatly influenced the writing of family history. This is not to suggest, however, that these are the only models, or that historians have not gone beyond them or taken new departures. As James Milden's extensive bibliographical survey of the works on the history of the family to 1977 indicates, there has been a considerable amount of interest and activity in this field of study. But the questions, themes, and arguments set out by these writers keep recurring in the most recent works on the history of the family and the history of childhood. As so often happens, attractive, popular models become truths entrenched in the public mind, and much scholarly energy is devoted to elaborating on these models, revising, or dismantling them.

Many interpretations of the history of the family have distinct ideological bases. For example, the works of Christopher Lasch, Haven in a Heartless World. The Family Besieged (1977) [29] and Jacques Donzelot, The Policing of Families (1979) [30] reflect strong Marxist biases. Feminist interpretations abound in family studies as well. The history of women, like the history of childhood, is a necessary complement to the history of the family.

An important statement made in 1972 by C. John Sommerville in an article, "Toward a History of Childhood and Youth," noted the new direction family studies would take:

> Of greater importance than the development of new sources of evidence...will be the clarification of the goals of a history of childhood, and of the concepts which give it shape. The last century's efforts are unsatisfying because they are so largely one-dimensional, ruled, sometimes by no more than tacit preference for play over work, or amusement over seriousness. Historians continue to be interested in how children were "treated," but are beginning to discriminate

> between the questions of the economic position of children or youth, the ideological importance of "the child" in the reigning view of human nature, "the child" as society's hope for the future, and the actual efforts expended on children's welfare. For too long generalizations as to the status of children were taken from a society's professions of concern, the permissiveness, or the extent to which children were allowed a world of their own. But, as we are now reminded, permissiveness can be neglect, and interest itself can be a mask for envy. It is becoming clear that these various dimensions of interest, importance, protectiveness, leniency and acceptance--are quite separate matters.[31]

Examples of works of this nature are the books by Lasch and Donzelot just noted, Bernard Wishy's The Child and the Republic (1963),[32] J. F. Kett's Rites of Passage (1977),[33] and The Child Savers by A. M. Platt (1969, 1977).[34] These works differ markedly from many of the early works in their approach in that they focus on a particular problem in the history of childhood. They do not try to present a more general, all encompassing, sweeping interpretation of history in the manner of Ariès or deMause. Two recent works, however, which continue in the older pattern are Edward Shorter's The Making of the Modern Family (1975, 1977),[35] and Lawrence Stone's massive The Family, Sex and Marriage in England 1500 - 1800 (1977, 1979).

Many of those scholars who have approached the history of the family have fallen into one of two groups: the cultural historians and the social scientists.[36] These groups are not fixed or mutually exclusive by any means, but are only suggested as a very rough way of indicating the kinds of approach or the methods of investigation favoured by certain family historians.

Cultural historians include scholars like Ariès and deMause. As the discussion of these models has indicated, these individuals are concerned more with values and beliefs concerning family life in the past than with such things as family structures, fertility rates, and demographic patterns. No good cultural historian, however, is likely to suggest that these latter concerns are not of importance to the understanding and writing of family history. The sources preferred by cultural historians reflect their interests and determine their methodology. Their sources include popular literature of the day, novels, plays, poetry, marriage manuals, letters, diaries, paintings, and even domestic architecture.

The movement of social scientists into the field of family history has altered the character of family studies. As Milden writes:

> Social scientists have brought to family history theories, models, and methodologies from several disciplines as well as techniques in quantitative and computerized data analysis. The latter has resulted in ever larger and more complex studies of the family in history and has permitted the use of new and potentially rich source materials such as vital statistics and census schedules. Rather than reconstructing the history of one family, family historians now attempt to recreate the collective biography of all families of a given ethnic or economic group in a particular community. This shift in perspective from the individual to the many, from the unique to the normative, has altered significantly the character of historical family studies.[37]

Quantitative techniques are not popular with all family historians. Both cultural historians and social scientists have criticized the quantitative approach. Critics argue, quite justly, that certain things that we would like to know about family are simply not quantifiable. How does one quantify a moral value or measure the affective bond between parent and child? In addition, quantification does have its own particular technical problems. Yet, as Edward N. Saveth writes in his article, "The Problem of American Family History":

> Meaningful variables, expressed quantitatively, could lead to better and more precise understanding of what is meant by that difficult concept, the "family type," defined with reference to time and place. As a means of type definition quantification presents difficult technical problems, and also has limitations with respect to important variables that do not lend themselves to quantitative expression. However, it is superior to subjective impressions of what is happening to family type in space and time, to guesswork about "trends" or to the structuring of..."ideal types."[38]

Some of the best quantitative history pertaining to history of the family has come from the work of Peter Laslett and the Cambridge Group for the History of Population and Social Structure. Laslett's own work, The World We Have Lost (1965, 1979),[39] concentrates on the family and the community in pre-industrial England. It is, without a doubt, one of the most important contributions to family history since 1960. Household and Family in Past Time (1972),[40] edited by Laslett, is another important study which uses quantitative methods. This book includes the work of the Cambridge Group and pertains to a much wider geographical area than The World We Have Lost.

Few family historians now rely strictly on either the quantitative or the qualitative approach. Family history is becoming truly interdisciplinary, a development to be welcomed, despite the increasing demand this places on scholars in the field to acquire more research skills, techniques, and methods of analysis. Some of the most recent works on family history make use of both quantitative and qualitative techniques. Both Edward Shorter in The Making of the Modern Family, and Lawrence Stone in The Family, Sex and Marriage in England 1500 - 1800 use both methods. Both methods will be used in this thesis.

Lawrence Stone's work, The Family, Sex and Marriage in England 1500 - 1800 will serve as an important reference point here. This is not to suggest that his interpretation of the family is the best or that there will be no reference to other interpretations. Stone's work will be used because it focuses on the English family and because it is also one of the most recent full-scale studies of the family. Other recent interpretations, such as that of Edward Shorter, include reference to developments in England, but Stone's work is the only recent comprehensive study of the English family. His massive work also incorporates previous important studies, such as those of Laslett and the Cambridge Group, Shorter, Ariès, and deMause, as well as some recent relevant works by scholars concentrating on the continental European and American families in history. He uses a wide variety of sources, such as letters, diaries, novels, newspapers, as well as demographic and legal records. Although Stone's book ends at 1800, there are references to later nineteenth and twentieth century developments. His book provides a starting point for this and other studies.

As stated at the beginning of this introduction, an important part of this thesis will be a consideration of the extent to which the image of the family presented to children in their literature between 1815 and 1837 conforms to generally accepted interpretations of the family in the past. This kind of comparison will serve a number of purposes. It will help locate this study in a particular area of inquiry. It will make this study more than a survey of children's literature between 1815 and 1837; it will make it an examination of children's literature directed toward determining something about the English family at a particular period of time. Such a comparison will give the results of this examination more significance. It will connect these results to another body of information, an extensive multifaceted area of research. Without this connection, critical discussion of these results is not really possible. And although a study of an ideal or an image is justifiable, a worthwhile study in its own right, it is also useful to see how this image or ideal conforms to the real. Even though in this case the real consists of the interpretations of one or more historians, the exercise is still valuable. The past can offer only the bare facts. Most of what is perceived to be real about the past is interpretation.

A major justification for attempting to determine the image of the family presented to English children in the literature published for them between 1815 and 1837 is the fact that literature for children has rarely been examined for what it can reveal about the cultural tone of the social concerns of its time.[41] Anne Scott MacLeod, who has published such a study of American children's literature between 1820 and 1860, demonstrates the importance of children's literature to social and cultural history:

> Taken by itself, the children's fiction of any era would be a doubtful source of information about how children actually live and think, and certainly the juvenile fiction of 1820 - 1860, morally purposeful but bare-bones thin as literature offered no more than an occasional glimpse of the daily lives of real children. What the literature furnished in abundance was an insight into what adults wanted for and from the children of that time, and what their desires for children revealed about their own attitudes.[42]

As stated earlier, to study an ideal in and for itself can be a justifiable, worthwhile exercise. Indeed, very often, it is as important to look at the ideal as at the real, particularly when one is anxious to determine those things that influence patterns of behavior, attitudes, and moral values. Children's ideas, values, and behaviors are affected and formed by many things, but in the nineteenth century, one of the chief sources of influence was books written for children.

The late eighteenth and nineteenth centuries were the great days of children's literature. "Children's books," writes Harvey Darton in Children's Books in England. Five Centuries of Social Life, "did not stand out by themselves as a clear but subordinate branch of English literature until the middle of the eighteenth century."[43] By 1815, children's literature flourished, supporting numerous authors, book sellers, and publishers who catered to the juvenile mind. In an age which had not the distractions of radio, television, and motion picture, the influence of written material must have been very great indeed. Since the nineteenth century exalted the family and the family home as the "place of Peace; the shelter, not only from all injury, but from all terror, doubt, and division..a sacred place, a vestal temple, a temple of the hearth watched over by household Gods... shade as of the rock in a weary land, and light as of the Pharos in the stormy sea,"[44] it is hardly surprising that the family was the focus of many children's books. In these books, by means of a fictional family, correct or undesirable attitudes and behaviors could be imparted to children in a reasonably pleasant and entertaining way. The purpose of this thesis is to determine, by means of content analysis of a selected number of books published between 1815 and 1837, the image of the pre-Victorian family presented to children through their literature.

The dates chosen for this study correspond to two very important dates in English history--the Battle of Waterloo and the accession of Victoria. The conclusion of the Napoleonic Wars may be seen to mark the end of an era, and the accession of Victoria the beginning of another. This twenty-two year period of time, one of "strenuous activity and dynamic change, of ferment of ideas and recurrent social unrest, of great inventiveness and expansion"[45] was clearly a creative or formative period. A study of the English family in this formative period, with special concentration on the child, should be a useful contribution to social, cultural, and educational history as well as to family history. Those men and women who were establishing families, and those children who were growing up in those families during this period, helped create what is now referred to as the Victorian Age.

The type of books selected for examination in this thesis are didactic. Fairy tales, books of fantasy and romance, have not been included. Although this latter kind of literature existed between 1815 and 1837, it did not emerge as "unassailable" until the 1840's.[46] Fairy tales were frowned upon before the middle of the century by "anyone conscious of a moral sense."[47] Such notable figures as Rousseau and Maria Edgeworth disapproved of fairy tales "on the grounds of truth and reasonableness."[48] At the beginning of the nineteenth century, "a full attack, fierce and authoritative" was made on fairy tales by Mrs. Trimmer, a woman who was both a staunch supporter of the Established Church and one of the most influential writers of children's books of the time. Mrs. Trimmer was to write that Tales of Mother Goose and other such works were "only fit to fill the heads of children with confused notions of wonderful and supernatural events brought about by the agency of imaginary beings."[49] One of her correspondents was even more convinced of their harmfulness, indeed of their unwholesomeness. This lady wrote of Cinderella, one of the most popular of fairy tales:

> Cinderella...is perhaps one of the most exceptionable books that was ever written for children....It paints some of the worst passions that can enter into the human breast, and of which /sic/ little children should, if possible, be totally ignorant; such as envy, jealousy, a dislike to mothers-in-law and half-sisters, vanity, a love of dress, etc., etc....[50]

The same tone of disapproval was echoed by Mrs. Sherwood, the author of some four hundred books and tracts, a writer who "perhaps stood first among the moral writers of the period as the sternest mentor of the faults and failings of childhood."[51]

Fairy tales then, were not approved reading material for children much before the middle of the century when the influence of the great moralistic didactic writers like Mrs. Trimmer and Mrs. Sherwood had begun to wane. This development is beyond the historical period of this thesis.

It could be added too that although fairy tales and fantasies frequently make use of family settings, in this kind of literature the family and family relationships are distorted. In the fairy tale, the family is viewed from the perspective of the child rather than the adult--not at all the perspective approved of by Mrs. Trimmer and her colleagues as the comments on the harmfulness of Cinderella indicate. In this tale, all attention is focused on the misery of the abused, neglected child and the unjustness of her situation. There is no positive emphasis here on those behaviors and attitudes so dear to the hearts of nineteenth century parents such as filial duty, piety, and obedience. Moreover, as writers such as Bruno Bettelheim,[52] and Iona and

Peter Opie,[53] and Maureen Duffy[54] have argued, powerful psychological conflicts may lie just below the surface of this kind of tale. The fairy tale may in fact function as a vehicle for the working out of a variety of psychological tensions and anxieties. Thus, it is highly probable that the image of the family presented in this kind of literature will not be of the approved type. The focus of this thesis is on the approved type of family, the type of family presented to children by adults with the purpose of imparting to those children certain select, generally approved values and behaviors. It may well be that this ideal produced such great tensions in individuals that the flight into fairy tales and fantasies became necessary in the latter part of the century. Certainly this could be one explanation for the great popularity of escape literature after 1840. However, this subject, provocative as it is, is beyond the scope of this thesis. Fairy tales and fantasies belong to a distinct category of children's literature.

The books selected for study in this thesis are located in the Osborne Collection of Early Children's Books in Toronto, Canada. This remarkable collection is reputed to be one of the most extensive and complete of its kind. Its emphasis is on books for children published in England, and it contains many priceless first editions. The collection was given to the Toronto Public Library in 1949 by Edgar Osborne, an English librarian, in recognition of the work that had been done in Toronto to provide a library service for children.

The collection has expanded since the original gift, and now contains over ten thousand volumes.

The titles in the collection have been published in a two volume catalogue. A third volume is currently in progress. The catalogue itself is an invaluable source of information about the individual books in the collection. In many instances, the catalogue provides brief biographical notes on the authors, gives publishing information, and in some cases, includes a brief synopsis of the book itself. The titles are conveniently organized in the catalogue according to the subject matter.

The catalogue facilitated the initial selection of books for examination in the thesis. The initial selection was based on two factors: publication date and subject matter. Books published before 1815 but republished after this date were included on the assumption that republication indicated an ongoing interest in the particular story or subject matter. Similarly, books published after 1837 were included if it could be ascertained that these books were originally published between 1815 and 1837. In regard to subject matter, books which indicated a focus on the home, the family, parent-child or sibling relationships either by their titles or by the synopses provided in the catalogue were selected. Some authors, such as Mrs. Sherwood and her sister, Mrs. Cameron, were extremely prolific. Although the number of titles and publication information available indicated their popularity, care was taken not to overbalance the study by relying too heavily on their books for information. A reasonably representative sample of the didactic literature available to children during this period was desired. The final sample on which this thesis is based consists of one hundred books and stories.

Admittedly, it is not certain that all the books in the sample were widely read. The popularity of some books can be determined by the publication information that may be available. It may be assumed that a book that went into more than one edition was popular for a time at least. Reference to a title in diaries, letters, or memoirs probably indicates some popularity as well. Critical reviews of some books still exist which provide additional clues to popularity. Yet this uncertainty cannot be overcome in all cases. It is believed, however, that the sample size here is large enough to overcome difficulties that might have been presented to this study by this lack of certainty.

As far as it could be determined, the authors of the books in the sample were of middle or upper class background. In many cases this information could be obtained simply from the available biographical data. In other cases this information was determined from the content of the books themselves. The story setting and easy familiarity on the part of the author with upper class modes of behavior, dress, and details of domestic architecture indicated an upper class background. Not all stories dealt with upper class families, but in many instances, the way in which the lower class family was presented was a clear guide to the social background of the author. The characteristic tone of these stories would be termed patronizing or condescending today. There was also an interesting lack of realism in the portrayal of lower class families by some authors. For example, in The Shepherd of Salisbury Plain (1795; 1830) by Hannah More,[55] one of the shepherd's daughters was described as having a "fine plump cherry-cheek," and a son was called "a rosy faced fellow." These descriptions hardly matched the descriptions given of the family's destitute situation. It should not be surprising that the authors of these children's books belonged to the upper classes. These individuals had both the leisure and the literary skills that were denied to the overwhelming majority of lower class men and women.

It is known that some books in this sample were read by both upper and lower class children. The books and tracts of Hannah More, Legh Richmond, and Mrs. Sherwood, for example, were distributed in charity schools and Sunday schools throughout England. Many members of the lower classes were literate even though compulsory schooling was not brought into effect until many years later. It must be assumed that any one or all of these books in the sample could have been read by both upper and lower class children. It is probable, however, that many of the books, particularly those that focused exclusively on upper class family situations, would have held little interest for most lower class children, and therefore would not have been read by them. Lower class children also had little leisure time for reading. Since certain books, such as The Shepherd of Salisbury Plain, The Dairyman's Daughter (1809; 1840), and The History of Isaac Jenkins (1792; 1831)[56] were written purposely for lower class consumption, it could be argued that they were used as a means of social control. However, the motives of those benevolent do-gooders who wrote tracts and stories for the instruction and entertainment of the poor were seldom unmixed. Moreover, it is dangerous to judge their actions too harshly from this distance in time, so far removed from their original social, cultural, and historical context. To completely deny that there was any element of social control in these books would be unwise. Yet to vigorously impose such a strict interpretation on the didactic literature of this period would be equally injudicious. A detailed examination of the social control element in children's literature in this period of history is a study in its own right, and therefore, beyond the scope of this thesis.

A combined quantitative-qualitative approach was used in the examination of the books. The books were examined individually in terms of a number of questions grouped into topics considered pertinent to a study of the family. The information derived from these questions was recorded in chart form and supplemented where possible or appropriate by descriptive examples from the books themselves. The four topics were developed into four thesis chapters: The Structural Features of the Family and Household Composition; Internal Relationships; The Relationship between the Family, the Household, and the

Community; and The Family and Education and Recreation. The following paragraphs will indicate briefly the kind of information that was sought and the procedure that was used.

The first and most basic kind of information required for a study of the family is knowledge of its size and composition. What was considered the ideal number of children in a family in pre-Victorian children's books? Was there a preferred sex ratio? What was the age spread? Was the ideal family of the nuclear or extended family type? Did the household include relatives, servants, nurses, tutors, and governesses? Was the family or household size affected by social class, urban or rural conditions? Were both parents normally present at all times? How often was the place of an absent parent occupied by a stepparent or a relative? Questions such as these were grouped under the topic of the structural features of the ideal pre-Victorian family.

After examining the external features of the family, it was reasonable to look at the more complex internal features of the family, to consider the relationships between the family members and members of the household. Here the roles of the parents were examined as well as matters of control, discipline, and authority. Were the roles of the parents distinct, based on sex differentiation, or did they merge? Who was the central figure in the family? What kind of relationships existed between siblings? How were emotions dealt with? Did relatives or servants have clearly defined roles or spheres of influence?

Since families in real life do not exist in a social vacuum but must carry on relationships of varying degrees of intensity and importance with the community, so must fictional families be expected to interact with the rest of society. But how? Under this topic it was necessary to determine the sorts of community activities that were considered typical or desirable for the ideal family. What kind of relationship did the ideal family have with other families in the neighborhood, with merchants, tradesmen, clergymen, and other professionals? What effect did social class have on the nature and frequency of these relationships? Did the ideal family participate in such community activities as fairs and exhibitions, and in what capacity? Did the family attend church or chapel regularly? Did the family participate in activities sponsored by the church? What roles did the church and other outside agencies play in the life of the family? What was the relationship between the family and the world of work and industry?

On the topic of education and recreation, pertinent questions dealt first with methods of education. Was the right education to be had at home or outside? Were children sent away to boarding school or did they attend a day school near by? Did the education of girls differ from that of boys? What role did the parents play in the education of their children? What social values, behaviors, and moral attitudes were emphasized? In terms of recreation, what games and pastimes were encouraged? How were leisure hours spent? Did parents participate in activities with their children? Did they take holidays or go on outings together? How were these activities affected by social class? Were children encouraged to play with other children outside the family, to visit other families, or go on excursions with them?

The primary source material for this thesis is the books published for children between 1815 and 1837. The secondary source material necessary for background information and reference has been taken from several disciplines and research areas: history, sociology, literature, history of childhood, history of women, history of education and history of the family. It is believed that this thesis can make a contribution to all of these areas, and may provide useful information for comparison studies. For example, popularly held concepts of the family and of childhood in the nineteenth century are derived largely from biographies, autobiographies, diaries, letters, and contemporary novels. How do these presentations of the family and of childhood compare with the image of the family and childhood presented in children's literature? How does this image compare with the interpretations of the family and childhood presented by such scholars as Ariès, deMause, and Stone? In the field of history of education, the information presented in this thesis should contribute something to an important but still neglected area of research--the relationship between the family and education. For too many years the history of education was confined to the history of formal education, the history of schools and schooling. In the last two decades, there has been increasing emphasis on determining the relationship between social and cultural history and the history of education. It is understood that the latter cannot be studied in isolation, and that education means much more than schools and schooling. If books for children can be considered one of the most important means of influencing the child's future growth and development--and indeed the purpose of books for children between 1815 and 1837 was blatantly didactic, in spite of any attempts to amuse or entertain--surely the image of the family presented to children in their literature must have significance for historians of education as well as for historians of childhood and the family.

To recapitulate, the selected books will be examined in the following chapters under four broad topics: the structural features of the ideal family and household composition; relationships within the family; relationships between the family and the community; and the family and education and recreation. Information on these topics has been elicited by the consideration of questions such as those which have been given above. This information will be examined, analyzed, and interpreted in the chapters that follow. In the final chapter of the thesis, the data will be brought together for further examination and analysis in order to determine the image of the family presented to children in the books written and published for them in the pre-Victorian period. This image will then be closely examined in the light of current generally accepted interpretations of the history of the family.

NOTES

[1] James Wallace Milden, The Family in Past Time. A Guide to the Literature (New York: Garland Publishing Inc., 1977), p. ix.

[2] Lawrence Stone, "The Massacre of the Innocents," The New York Review of Books, November 14, 1974.

[3] Philippe Ariès, Centuries of Childhood. A Social History of Family Life (New York: Vintage Books, 1965), p. 10.

[4] Ibid., p. 128

[5] Ibid., p. 129

[6] Ibid., p. 405.

[7] Ibid., p. 353.

[8] Ibid., p. 356.

[9] Ibid.

[10] Ibid., pp. 364 - 365.

[11] Ibid., p. 407

[12] Ibid., p. 411

[13] Ariès with Jacques Mousseau, "The Family, Prison of Love," Psychology Today, August, 1975, pp. 51 - 58.

[14] Barbara J. Harris, "Recent Work on the History of the Family: A Review Article," Feminist Studies, vol. 3, no. 3/4, 1976, pp. 162 - 163.

[15] Ibid.

[16] Stone, "Massacre."

[17] Lloyd deMause, "The Evolution of Childhood" in The History of Childhood edited by Lloyd deMause (New York: Harper and Row, 1975), p. 5.

[18] Ariès, op. cit., p. 10.

[19] Ibid., p. 33.

[20] deMause, op. cit., p. 5.

[21] Ibid., p. 6.

[22] Ibid., p. 1.

[23] Lloyd deMause, "Our Forebears Made Childhood a Nightmare," Psychology Today, April, 1975, p. 85.

[24] Ibid.

[25] Ibid.

[26] Ibid., p. 88.

[27] Ibid.

[28] Lawrence Stone, The Family, Sex, and Marriage in England 1500 - 1800 (New York: Harper and Row, 1977). An abridged and revised edition of the book was published by Penquin Books in 1979.

[29] Christopher Lasch, Haven in a Heartless World. The Family Besieged (New York: Basic Books, 1977, 1979).

[30] Jacques Donzelot, The Policing of Families (New York: Pantheon Books, 1979).

[31] C. John Sommerville, "Toward a History of Childhood and Youth," Journal of Interdisciplinary History, iii (1972) pp. 445 - 446.

[32] Bernard Wishy, The Child and the Republic (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1980). First published in 1968.

[33] J. F. Kett, Rites of Passage (New York: Basic Books, 1977).

[34] A. M. Platt, The Child Savers (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1977).

[35] Edward Shorter, The Making of the Modern Family (New York: Basic Books, 1977). First published in 1975.

[36] This division is suggested by Milden in his introduction, op. cit., pp. ix - x.

[37] Ibid., p. x.

[38] Edward N. Saveth, "The Problem of American Family History," American Quarterly, 21 (1969), p. 323.

[39] Peter Laslett, The World We Have Lost, second edition (London Methuen, 1979).

[40] Peter Laslett, ed., Household and Family in Past Time (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1972).

[41] Anne Scott MacLeod, A Moral Tale, Children's Fiction and American Culture 1820 - 1860 (Hamden Conn.: Archon Books, 1975), p. 13.

[42] Ibid., p. 16.

[43] Frederick Joseph Harvey Darton, Children's Books in England. Five Centuries of Social Life (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1958), p. 1.

[44] John Ruskin, quoted in W. E. Houghton, The Victorian Frame of Mind 1830 - 1870 (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1975), p. 343.

[45] David Thomson, England in the Nineteenth Century 1815 - 1914 (Penguin Books, 1975), p. 33.

[46] Darton, op. cit., p. 221.

[47] Ibid., p. 94.

[48] Ibid., p. 96.

[49] Ibid., p. 97.

[50] Quoted in Darton, op. cit., pp. 96 - 97.

[51] Toronto Public Library, The Osborne Collection of Early Children's Books 1476 - 1910, a Catalogue (Prepared at Boys and Girls House by Judith St. John with an introduction by Edgar Osborne. Two volumes, 1958 - 1975), vol. I, p. 298.

[52] Bruno Bettelheim, The Uses of Enchantment: The Meaning and Importance of Fairy Tales (New York: Random House, 1977).

[53] Iona and Peter Opie, The Classic Fairy Tales (New York: Oxford University Press, 1980).

[54] Maureen Duffy, The Erotic World of Faery (New York: Avon Books, 1980).

[55] Hannah More, The Shepherdof Salisbury Plain (London: J. Hatchard and Son, ca. 1830). First published in 1795.

The publication date(s) of a book will be given the first time it is noted in the text of the thesis. When two dates are given, the first will refer to the original date of publication and the second to the date of the edition used in the thesis.

Full bibliographical information will be given also in the appropriate note at the end of the chapter.

[56] More, op cit.

Legh Richmond, The Dairyman's Daughter (London: The Religious Tract Society ca. 1840). First published in 1809.

Thomas Beddoes, The History of Issac Jenkins (Dublin: printed by R. D. Webb, 1831). First published in 1792.

CHAPTER II

STRUCTURAL FEATURES OF THE FAMILY AND HOUSEHOLD COMPOSITION

CHAPTER II

STRUCTURAL FEATURES OF THE FAMILY AND HOUSEHOLD COMPOSITION

I. Introduction

As Lawrence Stone writes in his introduction to The Family, Sex, and Marriage in England 1500 - 1800:

> The best way to start an analysis of family structure is to establish the demographic facts, which inexorably dictated so many of its basic features, including such apparently independent variables as emotional commitment.[1]

It is not possible to seriously discuss the character or quality of parent-child relationships in a family at any period of time without knowing whether or not both parents were present. It is also necessary to know the size of the family in question. The number of children competing for the attention and affection of the adults is another important factor in determining the nature of parent-child relationships. The economic position of the family should also be considered, for it is highly possible that the amount of economic security the family enjoys will influence affective relationships. Once the basic demographic facts have been established, many questions are open to examination and discussion.

The purpose of this chapter is to establish the demographic facts pertaining to the families presented in the literature selected for examination in this thesis. This data will be compared with information derived from more conventional historical sources, in order to determine whether or not any degree of conformity exists between the historical or "real" family and the fictional family.

Although the sample size totals one hundred books and stories, the number of families to be considered is one hundred and nineteen. In the majority of stories, one family was clearly distinct in terms of importance and influence from any others that were presented in the story. However, in a number of instances, this distinction could not be made without significantly altering the sense and purpose of the story itself. In some cases, authors presented two or more families for purposes of comparison. For example, Mrs. Sherwood introduced three families in Susannah (1827). Susannah, an orphan, was raised in three families by three very different guardians. The three families were described in considerable detail, compared and contrasted in order to demonstrate which behaviors were wholesome and desirable and which were not. The adults in the first family were portrayed as severe and eccentric. The little girl was most unhappy in their gloomy household. The second set of adults were indulgent, indolent, and careless. As a result, their children were not well behaved and their household affairs were chaotic. The third family was the ideal family. In contrast to the other guardians, these guardians were firm but gentle, pious, genteel, and their household affairs were well ordered.

Although this was clearly the desirable image of the family, the two less desirable families were essential to the sense and purpose of the story. Similarly, in The Fruits of Education by Mrs. Cameron (1827), two contrasting images of the family were presented. A motherless brother and sister were raised apart by two different guardians, the boy by a godly uncle, and the girl by a pleasure-loving cousin. Each family was distinct, and the pattern of life in each family was described in detail. The author's purpose was to contrast two methods of child-rearing and to compare the results. The ideal was emphasized by the force of the contrast.

II. Social Class and Occupation

Of the 119 fictional families which are the focus of this thesis, 31 were considered to be upper class, 67 middle class, and 21 lower class.

Decisions regarding social class allocation were not always easy to make. A variety of criteria were considered before assigning a family to a social class. The occupation of the father was an important guide, but this was not always given. In any case, simple knowledge of the father's occupation was not always enough, and it was then necessary to search the content of the story for further indications of social class. For example, such a profession as clergyman could conceivably include all classes of society. Further information about the family's social status could be determined by careful consideration of the general level of material comfort the family appeared to enjoy. Physical descriptions of such items as the house, furniture, clothing, children's playthings, and the presence or absence of servants, were important indicators of social class. Interestingly, illustrations, where they appeared, were not always reliable sources of information about social class. The illustrations used to embellish a particular book were not necessarily created expressly for that book, but could have been taken from the large stock of illustrations ordinarily kept by the publishers of the time.[2] It was not uncommon to find illustrations of children dressed in clothing inappropriate for their social class or occupation. For example, in A Visit to the Farm by James Bishop (1835), Master George, the grandson of "farmer Jones," was shown working in the garden, making hay, angling, and harvesting dressed at all times like a little gentleman in the finest of clothes--a hat, short coat, ruffled shirt and vest.

"Middle class" included a diversity of income levels. For example, both the modest London shopkeeper who hoped to improve his standard of living by emigrating to Canada in What Trade Shall I Be? (1830), and the successful merchant who was able to employ governesses, nurses, and servants for his children in Ann Taylor's book, The Family Mansion (1819), were considered middle class. It was not always easy to separate the more prosperous middle class families from the upper class families. Titles indicating social rank were not always provided. In terms of life style, modes of dress, and behavior, the upper middle class was often indistiguishable from the upper class. This situation does, however, reflect contemporary social conditions. Upper class aspirations were common among members of the middle class.

Although the line between middle class and upper class was sometimes difficult to determine, the difference between middle class and lower class was much more obvious in the didactic literature. The lack of material comforts enjoyed by lower class families was emphasized repeatedly. The behavior of lower class families was often the focus for moral example. These families were either models of piety and industry who struggled on in the face of all odds, often being rewarded unexpectedly for their labours, as in Hannah More's work, The Shepherd of Salisbury Plain, or they were examples of ignorance, idleness, and degeneracy, like the Jenkins family in The History of Isaac Jenkins by Thomas Beddoes, who just might be rescued through the benevolence of a paternalistic doctor or clergyman.

It should not be surprising that the majority of stories focused on upper and middle class families. As noted in the introductory chapter of this thesis, as far as it could be ascertained, the authors of this sample of didactic literature were themselves members of the upper and middle classes. Moreover, the fact that the majority of families in the literature may be categorized as middle class appears to have reflected the growing power and influence of the middle class in this period of history.[3]

As already noted, the occupation of the head of the family was one important indicator of social class. The following table shows the occupations represented in the literature:

TABLE 1

OCCUPATION OF FATHERS

Occupation	Numbers Employed
Gentlemen	18
Clergymen	13
Military	10
Merchants/Shopkeepers	7
Administrators	2
Physicians	2
Teachers	1
Clerks	1
Businessmen	1
Tradesmen	2
Farmers	7
Laborers	8
No data	47
Total	119

Of the 72 occupations that were given, "gentleman" was the most common. It was a term used to indicate an individual who seemed to draw his income from a private or independent source such as rents or investments. The families concerned were from both the upper and middle classes, and as may be expected, all enjoyed a considerable degree of comfort. The middle class fathers who were classified as gentlemen were among those who would be considered upper middle class. Their houses had nurseries and gardens, and their children had nurses, servants, and perhaps governesses and tutors, as was the case in The Fruits of Education by Mrs. Cameron, and The Family Mansion by Ann Taylor.

Clergymen were the heads of families in 13 stories. "Clergyman" was, of course, a respectable middle class profession. In the literature, it did not include any members of the upper or lower classes. Some clergymen, such as Mr. Sandys in Improvement by Diana Bayley (1832), were clearly wealthier than others. Mr. Sandys was able to afford fashionable boarding schools for his son and daughter, and to maintain a large house in London. He appeared to have a private income in addition to that which he received for performing his clerical duties, for he decided he must leave his children with grandmamma while he travelled around the country attending to his private affairs. At the other end of the scale was the young clergyman in Maria Budden's book, Nina, An Icelandic Tale (1814), who lived and worked among the peasant farmers and shepherds in an isolated mountain parish.

The military provided occupations for the fathers of 10 families. In all cases but one, however, these were officer positions held by middle and upper class individuals. Only one man was a common sailor, and he was a member of the lower class. Many of the officers concerned seemed to have served in India or the West Indies--an interesting reflection of the beginning of British imperial interests.

Laborers formed another significant occupational group. The work of 4 laborers was specified: thatcher, woodcutter, shepherd, and dairyman. Those 4 laborers whose work was not specified were probably day laborers or casual workers, most likely in agriculture, for as it will be seen, the overwhelming majority of families lived in rural conditions.

Seven family heads were classed as farmers, and still another 7 were merchants. In both cases, the income levels varied greatly. Farmers included gentleman farmers like Mr. Wingfield in *The Advantages of Education Elucidated, in the History of the Wingfield Family* (1819), and more humble individuals such as farmer Darwin in *The History of Farmer Darwin and his Family* by Anne Selwyn (1825), and the blind farmer described by Barbara Hofland in her book, *The Blind Farmer and his Children* (1819). Mr. Wingfield was able to employ servants and maintain a comfortable home, while the latter two had to rely on the resourcefulness of their families in order to make ends meet. Similarly, merchants included the comfortable individuals described in *The Two Edwards* by Mrs. Cameron (1824), and the small London shopkeeper of *What Trade Shall I Be?*, who had to emigrate to Canada in order to make a respectable living for his family.

Other occupational groups were represented in much smaller numbers in the literature. Two family heads were tradesmen, and of these two, one was described specifically as a silversmith. Two fathers held administrative positions, one as the governor of Iceland in Nina, An Icelandic Tale. The other family head was described simply as a public officer by the author, Harriet Ventum in her book, The Good Aunt (1813). Since the latter gentleman appeared to belong to the upper class, it is unlikely that he would have received a salary for his work. In the early nineteenth century, the upper classes still regarded public service as an obligation or duty incumbent on their social rank. The governor of Iceland, a member of the middle class, did receive a salary for his office. Indeed, his livelihood appears to have been based on the income received from this occupation, for when he died, his children suffered material as well as personal loss. Their standard of living dropped drastically, and only their own resourcefulness, aided by the generosity of friends, saved them from destitution.

To conclude the list of occupations, two physicians appeared in the sample, one businessman whose business was unspecified, one parish clerk, and one teacher. The latter supplemented his income with clerical work. All these individuals were members of the middle class.

Information was unavailable for 47 of the fictional families considered. In some cases, this information simply was not given, and in others, not enough information was provided in the story itself to make a reasonable conjecture. In the remainder, the father was absent or dead.

Because information was unavailable for such a large number of fictional families, there can be no serious comparison between the fictional data and the historical data. It could be said that the high occupational preferences for clergymen, merchants, military men, farmers, and laborers does reflect in a general sort of way the pattern of occupational preferences of the period. It would not be judicious to add much else.

A note concerning social mobility may be added at this point. In the great majority of stories, 97, there was no change in the family's social position during the course of the story. Seven families showed an upward trend, usually the result of industry and perseverance, while 15 families saw their fortunes decline. Sudden downward social mobility was usually due to death or illness in the family, as in Nina, An Icelandic Tale, The Blind Farmer and his Children, and The History of Farmer Darwin and his Family. Improvidence, idleness, and carelessness were also causes of downward social mobility as Mrs. Cameron demonstrated in her book, Sophia (1829).

III. The Family Residence

1. The Location of the Residence

By far the majority of families, regardless of social class or occupation lived a rural environment. Ninety-seven households were considered rural in contrast to only 11 urban households. Another 7 families either had homes in both urban and rural areas, or moved from one to the other in the course of the story. Those families that owned two homes were among the wealthier families considered. Families that chose to move did so for reasons of health or economics. For example, in The Two Edwards, frail and sickly young Edward was sent to the country to recover his health. In The History of a Merchant's Widow and her young Family by Barbara Hofland (1814; 1825), a young mother, faced with enormous debts following the death of her husband, decided to move from London to the country in order to save enough money to pay her creditors. In only four cases was there insufficient information in the story to determine the location of the household.

Households were considered urban if they appeared to be located in a city or large town. London and Edinburgh were two urban centers actually named. Households located in or near small towns or villages were considered rural. As indicated, in most cases it was not difficult to determine the household setting. In a reasonable number of books and stories, the author actually stated the location of the household in the opening paragraphs. Even if the author made no such statement, there were usually clear indications in the story itself. Incidental references to everyday scenes, descriptions of nature, the landscape, and daily activities, provided important clues. Descriptions of children's recreational activities in particular provided important information. Where and how the children amused themselves, and the kinds of pets they cherished, were often valuable indicators of the location of the household. The following chart indicates the location of the households represented in the literature:

TABLE 2

LOCATION OF HOUSEHOLDS

Social Class	Location of Household				
	Rural	Urban	Urban/Rural	Not Given	Totals
Upper	25	2	3	1	31
Middle	52	8	4	3	67
Lower	20	1	0	0	21
Totals	97	11	7	4	119

From the didactic point of view, it is not surprising that a rural setting was the choice for so many books and stories. A rural environment had long been considered the healthiest place to raise a child. The virtues of a rural upbringing were perhaps best extolled by Rousseau in the eighteenth century in his classic book on education, Émile. But Rousseau was not the first or the last to praise the rural life. Poets, philosophers, literary men and women in general referred to the rural life in romantic, sentimental terms. Probably the best portrayal of the happy, healthy childhood comes from the pen of William Wordsworth in the first two books of The Prelude.

The preponderance of rural households in the literature also reflects the contemporary situation. As the historian G. Kitson Clark notes in The Making of Victorian England:

> Before 1851 it has been calculated that the majority of the population, even of England lived in what could be called rural conditions, and the census of 1851 shows that even then one of the largest single sections of the working population was the agricultural labourers,

> while there is evidence that the great towns were constantly being filled by immigrants who had not been born in them....The general lesson of the state of affairs in 1851 would appear to be this. The characteristic processes of the nineteenth century, the urbanization, the mechanization, the development of factories had begun, but they had not penetrated as deeply into the life of the community as perhaps we are apt to think. Very much that existed in the Britain of 1851 was in fact closely akin to what had existed in 1800.[4]

Clark's statement is supported by the work of other historians, such as Phyllis Deane,[5] Peter Laslett,[6] and Asa Briggs.[7] Asa Briggs writes in his book, Victorian Cities:

> When Queen Victoria came to the throne in 1837 there were only five places in England and Wales outside London with a population of 100,000 or more. In 1800 there had been none....In 1841 only 17.27 per cent of the population lived in London and cities of 100,000 inhabitants or more.[8]

2. The House

A number of historians of the family have argued that there is a very definite relationship between developments in domestic architecture and the development of modern concepts of childhood and the family. For this reason, some attention must be given to the physical features of the family home in history and in the pre-Victorian children's literature selected for study.

Philippe Ariès emphasized the relationship between developments in domestic architecture and the development of modern concepts of childhood and the family in Centuries of Childhood. He argued that before the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries:

> Scenes depicted by artists were set either in an indeterminate space, or in public places such as churches, or in the open air....Before the fifteenth century,

> interior scenes are...extremely rare. But from that century on, they became increasingly common....The growing practice of depicting rooms corresponds to a new emotional tendency henceforth directed towards the intimacy of private life. Exterior scenes do not disappear--they develop into the landscape--but interior scenes become more common and more original, and they typify genre paintings during the whole of its existence. Private life, thrust into the background in the Middle Ages, invades iconography, particularly in Western painting and engraving in the sixteenth and above all the seventeenth century....If we look through collections of prints and paintings of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, we cannot help being struck by the positive flood of pictures of families.[9]

The interior of houses, then, becomes more important in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries at the same time that the conjugal family becomes important. Ariès noted that in the more community oriented atmosphere of the Middle Ages and the Renaissance, private homes, particularly the larger ones, were public places. These homes were the only places so-called "decent" people could meet. Inns and taverns were, more often than not, the haunts of low people, the thieves, prostitutes, soldiers, and adventurers. To quote Ariès:

> In these big houses, neither palaces nor yet mansions, we find the cultural setting of the concept of childhood and the family....The big house fulfilled a public function. In that society without a café or a 'public house', it was the only place where friends, clients, relatives, and protegés could meet and talk. To the servants, clerics, and clerks who lived there permanently, one must add the constant flow of visitors. The latter apparently gave little thought to the hour and were never shown the door....These visits gave the impression of being a positive occupation, which governed the life of the household and even dictated its mealtimes. These visits were not simply friendly or social: they were also professional....There were no professional premises, either for the judge or the merchant or the banker or the businessman. Everything was done in the same rooms where he lived with his family. Now these rooms were no more equipped for domestic work than they were for professional purposes.

> They communicated with one another and the richest houses had galleries on the floor where the family lived. On the other floors the rooms were smaller, but just as dependent on one another. None had a special function, except the kitchen, and even then the cooking was often done in the hearth of the biggest room.... People lived in general-purpose rooms.[10]

Lack of privacy was a feature of life in upper and middle class homes before the eighteenth century. Indeed, according to Ariès, this lack of privacy for a long time hindered the formation of concepts of the family.[11] But in the eighteenth century:

> The family began to hold society at a distance, to push it back beyond a steadily extending zone of private life. The organization of the house altered in conformity with this new desire to keep the world at bay. It became the modern type of house with rooms which were independent because they opened on to a corridor. While they still communicated with each other, people were no longer obliged to go through them all to pass from one to another. It has been said that comfort dates from this period; it was born at the same time as domesticity, privacy, and isolation, and it was one of the manifestations of these phenomena. There were no longer beds all over the house. The beds were confined to the bedrooms....In France and Italy the word *chambre* began to be used in opposition to the word *salle*--they had hitherto been more or less synonymous; the *chambre* denoted the room in which one slept, the *salle* the room in which one received visitors and ate: the *salon* and the *salle à manger*, the *camera* and the *sala da pranza*. In England the word 'room' was kept for all these functions, but a prefix was added to give precision: the diningroom, the bedroom, etc. This specialization of the rooms, in the middle class and nobility to begin with, was certainly one of the greatest changes in everyday life. It satisfied a new desire for isolation.[12]

These developments in domestic architecture are also discussed by Lawrence Stone in *The Family, Sex, and Marriage in England 1500 - 1800* in his section on the Closed Domesticated Nuclear Family type (1640 - 1800) under the topic, "The Growth of Affective Individualism." Stone writes that "trends to architectural privacy affected the wealthy, but in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries the housing of all classes down to that of yeoman and tradesman became more varied, more subdivided and more specialized in function, and thus offered greater privacy."[13]

Both Stone and Ariès emphasize the way in which privacy and isolation came to be associated with morality, in particular, sexual morality. One reason why the lower classes were so often considered immoral was that they, unlike the upper and middle classes, could not afford the luxury of specialized rooms. Not only was it common for parents and children to share the same sleeping room, they often shared the same bed. As may be expected, sexual knowledge was acquired at an early age. As the great chronicler of the lives of London's poor, Henry Mayhew, was to write in 1849:

> The philanthropist may exert himself on their behalf, the moralist may inculcate even the worldy advantages of a better course of life, and the minister of religion may warn them of eternal penalties which they are incurring, but there is an instructor in mischief, of which they must get rid ere they make any real progress in their laudable efforts and that is THE SINGLE BEDCHAMBER IN THE TWO ROOM COTTAGE.[14]

Of course, sexual morality became a major concern in the Victorian Age, but it was subject of grave concern even at the beginning of the nineteenth century. As one poet wrote in 1807:

> See! Crowded beds in those contiguous rooms
> Beds but ill parted by a paltry screen
> Of paper'd lath or curtain dropp'd between
> Daughters and sons to yon compartments creep
> And parents here beside their children sleep.
> Ye who have power, these thoughtless people part,
> Nor let the ear be first to taint the heart.[15]

A knowledge of the physical characteristics of the family dwelling is clearly important, for as Ariès, Stone, and others have demonstrated, there is a definite relationship between developments in the physical characteristics of the house and the development of modern concepts of childhood and the family.

John Gloag in Home Life in History declares that "the building activity of nineteenth century Britain is almost unbelievable."[16] A considerable portion of this building activity was devoted to domestic architecture, and an increasing number of its patrons were members of the burgeoning middle class. As Marion Lockhead observes in her book, The Victorian Household:

> Social habits helped to plan the house and its rooms. It grew more complicated as society in general grew more complex. The eighteenth century had been comparatively static, and people stayed more or less in that station to which it had pleased God to call them; but now they tended to move, upwards for preference. The middle class grew immensely.[17]

By the nineteenth century, the home had become a refuge from the outside world. Relatives, friends, neighbours, and clients no longer passed freely through it. Its very physical characteristics bespoke its preoccupation with isolation and privacy. The higher one's position on the social scale, the more privacy, isolation, and specialization one was able to enjoy. The middle and upper class houses of the years just prior to the accession of Victoria would not have differed substantially from Marion Lockhead's description of the typical Victorian house:

> The large Victorian house was distinctly functional; there was a room for every purpose or occupation, for

> every time of the day. The family descended from the bedrooms (the master of the house had his own dressing-room) to the breakfast-parlour or morning-room. Here the lady of the house might sit with her work or her letters, after she had seen cook and given out stores; here, if there were no schoolroom the children might do their lessons, under mamma's supervision. But we prefer a house in which there is a proper schoolroom with a governess in charge, as well as the nursery for the younger ones. Lunch was served in the dining-room, and the children came down to that; it was their dinner. After lunch, the lady received calls in the drawing-room; the evening was spent here, as a rule, but in a country house there was also the library, a more masculine apartment with heavier furniture, more amber colours, velvet rather than silk, and leather rather than velvet. The dining-room, too, was furnished, in dark colours, crimson or dark green, with a Turkey carpet, and large, strictly functional furniture; a sideboard or buffet, side-tables, dining-table and chairs; no ornamentation or superfluity except on the chimney piece.[18]

These characteristics of nineteenth century upper and middle class domestic architecture, with emphasis on privacy, isolation, and specialization were reflected in pre-Victorian children's literature.

House size was an important category to consider in the examination of the literature, for the size of the house ultimately determined the amount of privacy, isolation and specialization possible for members of the family. Three very general categories were used in reference to house size--small, medium, and large.

A small house was a house with only one or two rooms. As house size reflected a family's social and economic status, it is not surprising that these houses belonged to lower and lower middle class families. A total of 27 families out of the 119 lived in small houses.

The majority of fictional families lived in medium sized houses. The term medium was used to describe a wide range of sizes from the large cottage to the comfortable country home or London flat. The word "cottage" itself is misleading to North American readers, who tend to think of a cottage as a small, semi-permanent dwelling, a temporary residence. A number of houses that appeared relatively substantial, at least from descriptions of the various rooms and the activities that took place in them, were called cottages. For example, in Miss Grierson's book, The Visit (1824), the house was large enough to contain a gymnasium or exercise room for the children as well as a schoolroom. Yet the house was still referred to as a cottage. A total of 56 families out of 119 lived in medium sized houses.

A large house had even more specialized rooms than the medium sized house. In these houses, there were large formal dining-rooms, music rooms, various kinds of meeting rooms, libraries, to say nothing of bedrooms, dressing rooms, servants' quarters, and of course nurseries and schoolrooms. Thirty-five families out of 119 enjoyed such houses. The majority of these families belonged to the upper class.

In one instance, house size was considered not applicable. In the story, The Orphan Brothers (1825), a kind farmer gave two destitute orphan boys employment and shelter in his barn. It was only very much later in the story that these boys became efficient managers of the farm and came to share the farmer's house. For the greater part of the story, the boys lived in the barn as they learned their tasks.

One of the most important consequences of room specialization, at least for the history of childhood and the family, was the creation of the nursery. According to Jonathan Gathorne-Hardy, the author of The Rise and Fall of the British Nanny, 'nurcerys', as they were called, existed in the thirteenth century. He states:

> The dukes and great lords, the rich had always something very like the nurseries. Gradually as more people became wealthy and building became more sophisticated, more and more people had them....During the eighteenth century the nursery became increasingly common....But it would seem likely that it was during the first thirty or forty years of the nineteenth century that the Victorian nursery as it is often pictured finally crystallized--an austere area, furnished with furniture not needed elsewhere. Austere and remote--situated at the top or in farflung parts of the house, among the servants. When there was a fire it was the children or servants who burnt....[19]

In the children's books and stories examined here, the number of families with nurseries was only 22, rather less than the number one would expect, especially given the great number of middle and upper class families portrayed. But perhaps one should not expect to find a great number of nurseries between 1815 and 1837. If Gathorne-Hardy is correct in suggesting that the first thirty or forty years of the nineteenth century were the formative years in the evolution of the nursery, it is possible that the pre-Victorian period is slightly early to find nurseries in great numbers.

3. Household Furnishings and Housekeeping

Household furnishings provided another indication of the social and economic status of the family. As Elizabeth Burton writes in The Early Victorians at Home 1837 - 1867:

> There was nothing quite like a medley and muddle inside /a house/ to show off success. The more a room could be overcrowded, the more beaded, fringed, and upholstered, the more stuffed birds, reptiles, small animals, wax fruit or flowers under glass domes, the more ornamental china and glass knick knacks, paper weights, albums of water colours and drawings, the more boxes of all shapes and sizes, mats and coverings for tables, chairs, desks, and chimney pieces, the better it served its purpose. Its wearisome purpose was to show that the possessors had arrived....[20]

The categories used for household furnishings were adequate and inadequate or sparse. Nineteen homes were considered inadequately or sparsely furnished. With one exception, these were lower class homes. As the figures indicate, small house size did not necessarily mean that furnishings were inadequate or sparse. Nina, the heroine of the book by the same title, at one point lived modestly by herself in a small house. Since she did not appear to lack any material comforts, her house could not be considered sparsely or inadequately furnished.

In most cases, it was not difficult to determine whether or not a house was inadequately furnished. The poverty of the furnishings of a house were noted by the author in order to emphasize the family's destitution, as in The History of Isaac Jenkins or The Shepherd of Salisbury Plain. In Peggy and her Mammy by Mary Elliot (1819), the inadequate furnishings of the house became a major focus of the story. Little Peggy devoted all her spare minutes to making pincushions to sell in order to make enough money to buy her elderly "mammy" a new chair to rest in after her hard day's work.

One would like to know more about the physical appearance of the house, its furnishings and the arrangement of rooms than the authors of the books provide. However, since the central purpose of the didactic story was to teach, not to amuse or entertain, the actual physical details of the house were only incidental to the story. No doubt it was felt that too much detail might distract the young reader from the moral purpose of the story.

Housekeeping, particularly household cleanliness, was an important concern to many didactic writers. Cleanliness, closely associated with morality, was emphasized repeatedly in stories. Cleanliness was also associated with a variety of desirable virtues, such as industry, honesty, and self control. Those families that did not exhibit such virtues were unlikely to have clean houses. In The Little Woodman and his Dog Caesar by Mrs. Sherwood (1828), the decline and death of the father, accompanied by the growing cruelty and selfishness of the elder brothers, was reflected in the increasing lack of attention given to housekeeping. In contrast, in The History of Isaac Jenkins, as the family learned the virtues of industry and thrift and began to prosper, an increasing amount of attention was given by the family to details of housekeeping. The cottage was even whitewashed and the fixtures repaired. To illustrate that cleanliness or lack of it was not necessarily related to social class, Mrs. Sherwood showed slovenliness, idleness, self-indulgence, and of course, lack of cleanliness in the middle class home of one of orphan Susannah's guardians in Susannah.

The sheer physical effort required to keep the average middle class home clean in the nineteenth century would discourage many modern housekeepers. But in the nineteenth century, the average middle class family had servants. A cook, a housemaid, and a maid of all work were considered absolutely essential.[21]

4. The Garden

An important aspect of the pre-Victorian house was the garden. Gardens were a place of recreation for both adults and children and could be extremely elaborate and extensive. As Elizabeth Burton demonstrates in a lengthy chapter on gardens in The Early Victorians at Home 1837 - 1867, the English truly loved their gardens. She states:

> No stranger who visited England even then, when gardens with their geometric designs, their ever-increasing shrubberies, their rigid walks and unprepossessing convenient decorations were going through an ugly phase, was other than delighted or amazed by our genuine love of gardens and gardening, as well as our deep affection for the countryside. To some it seemed that it was only in the country Englishmen became real. 'It is in the country', Washington Irving wrote, 'that the Englishman gives scope to his natural feelings. He breaks loose gladly from the cold formalities and negative civilities of town; throws off his habit of shy reserve and becomes joyous and free hearted....The taste of the English in the cultivation of land and what is called landscape gardening is unrivalled'.[22]

For children especially, the garden was a source of great pleasure. In the literature, children often made pets of the birds and animals that lived in the garden. In Mrs. Trimmer's Fabulous Histories, also known as The History of the Robins (1786; 1818), the Benson children adopted a family of robins. Observing the robins afforded the children hours of amusement. The children's mother also found a way to combine amusement with instruction. The robin family's daily activities were the source of many enlightening lectures on morality and natural history. Domestic pets also lived in the garden. In The History of the Fairchild Family by Mrs. Sherwood (1818), the children's pet hare lived in the garden.

Children were usually allowed to play in the garden without adult supervision, but often mamma or papa would read to them in the garden or give them lectures on natural history. Mr. and Mrs. Fairchild certainly did this, as did the parents in Preludes to Knowledge by Elizabeth Somerville (1830), and The Child's Birth-day by Isaac Taylor (1811; 1815).

Like little Émile, the central figure in Rousseau's classic work on education, children were often given their own gardens or plots of ground in which to grow their own plants. In Ann Tytler's book, Mary and Florence (1835; 1837), two little girls learned valuable lessons in industry, humility, patience and perseverance through working in their gardens. In Emulation (1827), little Alfred preferred digging in his garden to working on his lessons, despite his mamma's disapproval. He sprained his ankle, however, in this exercise, no doubt as just retribution for not listening to his mamma. She was able to turn the whole episode to good account though, by using the time the little boy was confined to bed for telling him moral stories.

The destruction of a child's garden by a jealous or ill natured sibling or neighbor was an extremely serious matter. A wise and patient adult or a mature older child, however, was usually able to turn the affair into a morally profitable experience, as in The Little Quaker (1825). Gardens then, clearly had both recreational and educational functions.

The garden was a special place for many children. In his later years, John Ruskin, born in 1819, recalled most vividly the garden he knew as a child. In his autobiography, Praeterita, this great man of letters described the garden most lovingly:

> /The house/ had front and back garden in sufficient proportion to its size; the front, richly set with old evergreens, and well-grown lilac and laburnum; the back, seventy yards long by twenty wide, renowned all over the hill for its pears and apples, which had been chosen with extreme care by our predecessor, (shame on me to foreget the name of a man to whom I owe so much!) --and possessing also a strong old mulberry tree, a tall white-heart cherry tree, a black Kentish one, and an almost unbroken hedge, all round, of alternate gooseberry and currant bush; decked, in due season, (for the ground was wholly beneficent,) with magical splendor of abundant fruit: fresh green, soft amber, and rough-bristled crimson bending the spinous branches; clustered pearl and pendant ruby joyfully discoverable under the large leaves that looked like vine. The difference of primal importance which I observed between the nature of this garden, and that of Eden as I had imagined it, were, that in this one, all the fruit was forbidden; and there were no companionable beasts: in other respects the little domain answered every purpose of paradise to me; and the climate, in that cycle of our years, allowed me to pass most of my life in it.[23]

John Ruskin was less fortunate than the fictional children who had pets to play with in the garden. Even more poignant is the fact that Ruskin had no human friends to play with either, for his parents rarely associated with relatives or neighbors. He played alone in this beautiful garden.

> On the whole, I had nothing animate to care for, in a childish way, but myself, some nests of ants, which the gardener would never leave undisturbed for me, and a sociable bird or two; though I never had the sense

> or perseverence to make one really tame. But that was partly because, if ever I managed to bring one to be the least trustful of me, the cats got it. Under these circumstances, what powers of imagination I possessed, either fastened themselves on inanimate things--the sky, the leaves, and pebbles, observable within the walls of Eden,--or caught at any opportunity of flight into regions of romance, compatible with the objective realities of existence in the nineteenth century, within a mile and a quarter of Camberwell Green.[24]

The majority of families in the literature had gardens. A total of 85 gardens were noted. Even the poor had gardens. Admittedly, their gardens were functional since they were largely fruit and vegetable gardens, designed to supplement the meagre diet or the income. Yet even these gardens must have afforded some pleasure to lower class families. Fifteen lower class families had gardens. Upper and middle class gardens were designed to provide pleasure as well as fruit and vegetables for the table and flowers for the house. Many of these gardens would not have been unlike that owned by the Ruskin family. Twenty-three upper class families and 49 middle class families had gardens. An additional 3 families had a park, a playground, and a section of woodland to enjoy.

IV. The Family

1. Parents

One of the most striking characteristics of the families portrayed in the literature was the extremely high adult mortality rate. In only 61 families out of the 119 were both parents present. In 56 families one or both parents were dead or absent throughout the story or the greater part of it. Two families consisted of one bachelor and one spinster each. Thus close to half the families portrayed were single parent families. These high mortality rates showed no great respect for social class, as the following table indicates:

TABLE 3

ADULT MORTALITY RATES

Social Class	Total Number of Families	Families with both Parents Present
Upper	31	15
Middle	67	37
Lower	21	9
Total	119	61

When these figures were examined according to sex, it was found that although more mothers than fathers were present throughout the story, a greater number of mothers had died either before the story began, or died during the course of the story. Whereas 14 fathers were absent due to business obligations, military service, some unspecified reason, or simple desertion, only two mothers were noted to be absent, and in both cases, this absence was carefully explained. In Mary Campbell (1828), little Mary's mother was away in India with her husband. The little girl spent her time either at boarding school or with her beloved grandfather. In Flora by Elizabeth Somerville (1811; 1820), the natural mother was absent because the little girl had been kidnapped by gypsies, and later abandoned. Fortunately, she was found and cared for by a kindly widow. Her own mother only appeared at the end of the story in time for a happy ending.

There is some correspondence between the high adult mortality rate derived from the literature, and that which can be determined from contemporary records. It must be noted, however, that population figures for this period of history are always open to question. To quote Phyllis Deane in The First Industrial Revolution: "Our population statistics are incomplete. There was no full census of population taken for England and Wales until 1801 and no official registration of births and deaths until 1839."[25]

According to Peter Laslett, "Probably the most conspicuous feature of traditional society to be gathered from its vital statistics is its overwhelming youthfulness." Referring to the work of Gregory King, an eighteenth century demographer, Laslett continues:

> Gregory King calculated that above 45 per cent of all the people alive in his day were children, with some variation between town and country; there were, he reckoned, 33 per cent in London, 40 per cent in the other urban areas and 47 per cent in the villages.[26]

Laslett's own figures for 1821 indicate that the composition of society had altered very little ~~since~~ the end of the seventeenth century. The average age for the whole country at the end of the seventeenth century was 27.5 according to King. Laslett believes this figure is slightly high, and suggests that "the best estimate at present for a general average age of a pre-industrial English community is 25.4."[27] The population was young indeed.

Laslett's figures for life expectancy in the eighteenth century, based on a community in Devon, further indicates a high adult mortality rate. His life expectancy figures range from a low of 38.4 to a high of 45.1 years. King's figure for England is 32.0.[28]

The low life expectancy seems to have had little or no effect on marriage patterns. Laslett's figures show that the mean age at first marriage has altered very little from the seventeenth to the twentieth centuries. The mean age of bridegrooms at first marriage was 26.65, while the mean age of brides was slightly lower at 23.58. The mean age at marriage in our day is 28 or 29 for men and 25 or 26 for women.[29] As he states:

> It is not true to say that in earlier times, in the world we have lost as we have called it, people, either ordinary or privileged, married much younger than we marry now. In fact they were very much older in relation to their expectation of life.[30]

The low life expectancy figures, combined with a tendency toward late marriages, make it seem highly likely that one or both parents would not survive the child-rearing years.

Laslett's figures may be compared to those of E. P. Thompson, the author of The Making of the English Working Class. Using the calculations of contemporaries, Thompson gives the following figures for life expectancy, according to different social groups in a number of centers for 1842:[31]

	Gentry	Tradesmen	Labourers
Rutlandshire	52	41	38
Truro	40	33	28
Derby	49	38	21
Manchester	38	20	17
Bethnal Green	45	26	16
Liverpool	35	22	15
Leeds	44	27	19
Halifax	55	24	22

Clearly the death rate was highest among the lower classes. As Thompson writes, "the moneyed man might...rarely wear two coats at once, but his family had tenfold the chances of diagnosis, medicine, nursing, diet, space, quiet."[32] The living and working conditions of the poor naturally took their toll. Yet the average age at death even of the upper class was not high. In Liverpool it was as low as thirty-five years old. This indicates that the mortality rate was high in all classes, and that there must have been many single parent families.

Lawrence Stone discusses the high mortality rates among adults, particularly young adults in The Family, Sex, and Marriage 1500 - 1800. He states:

> In early nineteenth-century England, the mortality rate among adults between twenty-five and forty was about one per cent a year. Consequently there was a two per cent chance of one spouse or the other dying each year, which meant that not far off thirty per cent of all marriages were broken up by death in the first fifteen years.[33]

Stone's figures also support Laslett's claim that marriages were contracted relatively late. He writes:

> Daughters married on the average at about twenty in the late sixteenth century, rising to about twenty-two to twenty-three in the late seventeenth and eighteenth. When it comes to boys it is essential to make a clear distinction between the son and heir and his younger brothers, since they followed completely different patterns. The median ages at first marriage of heirs for the English squirarchy was about twenty-one in the early sixteenth century, twenty-two in the late sixteenth century, twenty-four rising to twenty-six in the seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries, and twenty-seven to twenty-nine in the eighteenth to early nineteenth centuries....Those younger sons who married, who were probably a decreasing proportion of the whole, did so considerably later than their sisters or elder brother. By the eighteenth century, they were on the average marrying in their early to middle thirties....

> The only other social group which married as late as their thirties or even forties in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries were the eight hundred odd fellows of Oxford and Cambridge colleges, a number of whom by the eighteenth century were themselves younger sons of gentlemen....By the mid-nineteenth century, and perhaps earlier, the academic profession had been joined by those of law and medicine, the mean age of marriage among whom had risen to twenty-eight by 1800 and to over thirty by 1870.[34]

Late marriage was in a large part due to economic, professional, and educational reasons. Late marriage was the pattern not only among the upper classes but among the middle and lower classes as well. As Stone states:

> It has been established beyond any doubt that all over northwest Europe, with some unexplained regional exceptions, the middle and lower classes of both sexes married remarkably late, certainly from the fifteenth century onward....A very large quantity of evidence for France, some for Italy, and a certain amount for England and America, proves that among small property owners and labourers the median age of first marriage was very high in the sixteenth century and went even higher in the seventeenth and part of the eighteenth centuries, rising from twenty-six to thirty for men and from twenty-four to twenty-seven for women. Slightly higher up the social scale among yeomen, husbandmen, and tradesmen, there is very little evidence to suggest that marriage may have taken place about a year earlier.[35]

Among the lower and middle classes, marriage had to wait until the couple could manage to accumulate enough capital to set up an independent household and support a family. Thus, as Stone concludes:

> It is clear, therefore, that the inexorable consequences of high adult mortality coupled with late marriage was a family structure which was fundamentally different from that to which we are accustomed today. Marriages were contracted late, and were normally broken early; couples rarely survived together for very long after their children had left home; remarriages were common; less than half of the children who reached adulthood did so while both their parents were alive; and only a small minority of parents lived long enough to become

> an economic burden on their children in their old age.... After less than seventeen years there was a fifty per cent chance that the marriage would be broken by the death of /the husband/ or his wife. In the Early Modern period this combination of delayed marriage, low life expectation and early fostering out of the surviving children resulted in a conjugal family which was very short-lived and unstable in its composition.[36]

The great number of single parent families represented in didactic children's books and stories cannot be regarded as an aberration. It reflected reality as the work of Laslett, Thompson, and Stone has shown. Since so many children were deprived of at least one parent before they were fully adult, an important question to consider is the effect this bereavement had on the development of affective relationships. According to Ariès, deMause, and Stone, from at least the eighteenth century on, families were drawing closer together, forming tight emotional bonds, pushing away the greater community. These high mortality rates, however, might have severely hindered the growth of affective ties. Is it really possible to have such a thing as a "Closed Domesticated Nuclear Family" when mortality rates are so high, first marriages so short in duration, and remarriages so common? And what of the children? As Stone writes, "How far this /high incidence of parental mortality/ created a serious psychological trauma for the child is an open question."[37] Unfortunately, to this point, scholars have not really seriously considered this question.

In spite of the high incidence of adult mortality in the literature, the number of stepparents that appeared was surprisingly low. There were only two "genuine" stepparents, that is, stepparents through remarriage, although there were another 8 situations involving adoptive parents or guardians. It appears that this does not reflect contemporary conditions. To quote Stone:

> Unions including widows or widowers with stepchildren of their own, or families which included orphaned or abandoned nephews or nieces were far from rare. Perhaps a quarter of all families were of this hybrid character.[38]

It was possible to approximate the ages of 108 of the parents and stepparents represented in the literature. Unless the parent's age was actually stated, which occurred only in a very few cases, an estimate was made based on indirect information provided in the stories themselves. Such things as business and recreational activities and the ages of the children provided important clues to the parents' ages. Three broad categories were used to represent the ages of the parents: -30 (young), 30+ (middle aged), and 60+ (old). As may be expected, the average parent was middle aged or approximately 33 years old. The youngest parent noted was 20 years old, the oldest 70. The following table illustrates the age distribution:

TABLE 4

AGE OF PARENTS

Age	-30 (young)	30+ (middle aged)			60+ (old)		Total
Age	20	30-39	40-49	50-50	60	70	
Number of Parents	1	88	10	4	4	1	108
Total Number of Parents	1	102			5		108

The health of the parents was considered an important subject because of its obvious association with mortality. Only 17 parents were noted to have poor health--8 fathers and 9 mothers. Poor health, however, did not lead inevitably to death. In The History of Isaac Jenkins and The Blind Farmer and his Children, for example, the parents actually recovered their health in the course of the story. Social class and location of residence did not seem to have any particular effect on health.

Details of the physical appearance of parents and step-parents were only rarely provided in the books and stories. It seems reasonable to assume that such details were not a major concern to these didactic writers because internal features, moral development were considered more important. One's true character was manifested naturally in a pleasant or unpleasant appearance in the majority of cases, and no further comment, description, or detail was necessary. By and large, the physical appearance of the adult characters was pleasant or positive because didactic writers of children's books wished to emphasize positive and desirable virtues.

2. Children

As should be expected, considering the nature of the literature, the overwhelming majority of families had children. Only 12 families appeared to be childless. In this period of history, most families contained children. According to Laslett, "a good 70 per cent of all households contained children--this figure is remarkably consistent from place to place and date to date--and there were between two and a half and three children to every household with them."[39] In the literature, 26 upper class families, 61 middle class, and 20 lower class families had children. Of these families, 9 lived in an urban environment, 87 lived in a rural environment and 7 lived in both urban and rural environments. For 4 families there was insufficient information to determine living conditions.

The total number of children in the stories was calculated to be 310, of whom 119 were boys and 142 were girls. The sex of another 49 children could not be determined. The average number of children per family was 2.89, a figure remarkably consistent with Laslett's. The range was 1 to 9 children per family.

The ages of the children ranged from infancy to adulthood, with an average age of approximately 9.24 years. It was not uncommon for a story to follow a child's growth and development from infancy to adulthood, as in the three-volume book by Mrs. Sherwood, The History of Henry Milner (1822; 1831-1844). Whenever it was necessary to estimate the ages of the children, the following categories were used: -6, 6+ and 12+.

Only 11 children were considered to be in poor health, the majority of whom, 7, were members of the lower class. As in the case of adults, poor health did not lead inevitably to death. The health of 6 children actually improved in the course of the stories. Among the lower classes, this improvement was usually due to a rise in the family fortunes, as in The History of Isaac Jenkins. Among the upper and middle classes, the child's health usually improved after a visit to a relative's farm or country estate, as in The Two Edwards, and James Bishop's little book, A Visit to the Farm. Deaths did occur in the stories, but not in an undue number, particularly considering the realtities of the period. In only 15 families did a death actually occur in the course of the story, and only a minority of these involved children.

Details of physical appearance were given more frequently for children than for adults. Twenty-one children were fair and 3 were dark. Two of the dark children, one boy and one girl, were considered to have an unpleasant or negative appearance. Both Ferdinand in The Little Prisoner by Catherine Parr Traill and Susanna Moodie (1828), and the sister of little adopted Mary in Motherless Mary (1816) were bad tempered and selfish children. Only 17 children were considered to have unpleasant or negative appearances. Again, a negative appearance was associated with unpleasant characteristics.

The incidence of stepchildren was not as high as might be expected considering the high adult mortality rate both in the literature and in this period of time. Only a total of 23 stepchildren were noted, 16 girls and 7 boys. Stepchildren ranged in age from less than 6 years old to adulthood. The average age was 7.43 years old. Stepchildren were remarkably healthy. No stepchild sickened and died in the course of the story. No stepchild had an unpleasant or negative appearance. Interestingly enough, where coloring was given, stepchildren were dark.

Before leaving the subject of children and stepchildren, it would be useful to briefly examine child mortality rates. As noted earlier, not only must high mortality rates have affected the structural features of the family, they must have had a profound effect on internal relationships and the development of affective ties. To quote Stone:

> The very high level of mortality, particularly an infant and child mortality rate of between thirty and fifty per cent...affected all classes of society, although the poor suffered more than the rich. Until this mortality rate began to fall in the late eighteenth century, family limitation was a gamble with death, since at any moment all the children might be wiped out by an epidemic disease, leaving none to inherit the propertied family name....The omnipresence of death coloured affective relations at all levels of society, by reducing the amount of emotional capital available for prudent investment in any single individual, especially such ephemeral creatures as infants. One result was the neglect of infants by their parents, which in turn reduced the latter's prospects of survival. This was a situation which encouraged the concept of the family as a group of replaceable surrogates, both spouses and more particularly children.[40]

As Stone writes, child mortality was high in all classes, but it was highest among the lower classes where adequate food and clothing, decent housing and medical attention were notoriously lacking. For example, referring to statistics compiled between 1837 and 1847 by a physician to the Sheffield General Infirmary, E. P. Thompson writes:

> Of the 11,944 deaths in Sheffield in this period, the age distribution is as follows:

under 1	2,983
1	1,511
2 to 4	1,544

> This gives us 6,038 deaths under the age of five, and

> the remaining 5,906 deaths distributed over the other age-groups. The infant mortality (0-1) rate in Sheffield at this time was about 250 in 1,000, while the 0 - 5 mortality rate was 506 in 1,000. Much the same is true of Manchester where (Dr. Kay noted) 'more than one-half of the off-spring of the poor...die before they have completed their fifth year', and where the Registrar-General's Report (1839) showed deaths in the 0-5 age groups of 517 in 1,000. But these figures underestimate and perhaps seriously underestimate the actual child mortality rate, because the industrial centers were constantly swelled with adult immigrants....In a survey undertaken on behalf of the employers of Manchester in 1833, it was found that the married spinners investigated had 3,166 children (an average of four and a half to each spinner): 'of these children, 1,922, or 60.5 per cent of the whole were alive, and 1,244, or 39.5 per cent, were dead'. One may reasonably assume that the 39.5 per cent might rise towards 50 per cent by the time that children who were infants at the time of the survey reached the age of five or failed to reach it.[41]

But death had no respect for social class. The most high born individuals succumbed to the same diseases as the most miserable slum dweller. Typhoid, typhus, and cholera visited the royal family in Kensington Palace and Windsor Castle as it visited the wretched families who inhabited Jacob's Island.

Death, then, was far more real to nineteenth century children of all classes than it is to children today. There was a very good chance that a child, regardless of social class, would experience the loss of at least one dear brother or sister, a cousin, a neighbor, or a playmate, to say nothing of the possibility that he or she would be bereaved of at least one parent before reaching adulthood. One wonders indeed how individuals and families coped with such trauma. Perhaps they really did suffer psychic numbing as Stone maintains.

Death did overshadow the pages of nineteenth century children's literature. Now, death rarely intrudes itself in children's literature. Although only 15 families actually suffered a death during the course of the story, references to past deaths of family members, and deaths outside the family were common. The Fairchild children, for example, encountered death several times. They were taken to view corpses, told of the violent death of a playmate, and given the edifying experience of witnessing the happy death of another child. Death was far more real to children in the nineteenth century than it is to children in the twentieth century. Not only did they experience it first hand, they were made to read about it. It may be that children, and adults too for that matter, experienced far less psychic trauma than we suppose simply because they were better prepared for it. The moralizing of the authors becomes less tedious, the death scenes become less macabre to twentieth century readers, when it is understood how prevalent death was, and how children had to be prepared psychologically and spiritually to meet it. After all, had not James Janeway reminded generation after generation of young readers, from the seventeenth century on:

> Did you never hear of a little Child that died? And if other Children die, why may not you be sick and die? And what will you do then, Child, if you should have no Grace in your Heart and be found like other naughty Children? How do you know but that you may be the next Child that may die? And where are you then, if you be not God's Child?[42]

3. Relatives

It is commonly believed that the family group in the past was large, that the extended family type, rather than the nuclear family type predominated. Peter Laslett calls this "supposition that the family group in the pre-industrial world was large...one of the most conspicuous of all the errors we seem to want to make about every day life in the old world."[43] The evidence Laslett presents in The World We Have Lost discredits this supposition. The evidence in the children's literature complements Laslett's work.

Historians of the family, who discuss the history of the family in terms of an evolutionary process, do leave the impression, whether intended or not, that the family in the past was very large, accommodating aged parents and a variety of relations and hangers-on. Gradually, it appears, the conjugal family excluded the extra persons, and developed into the compact, tightly knit unit familiar today. Ariès, Shorter, and Stone give this general impression, even though Shorter notes in his chapter, "Household and Community in Traditional Society," "North America and the British Isles were the principal bastions of the kinless domestic unit,"[44] and Stone, in his chapter, "The Demographic Facts," writes that "only a small minority of parents lived long enough to become an economic burden on their children in their old age,"[45] indicating that only a very few households would contain grandparents. The very organization of their histories however, almost belies these statements. For example, Shorter devotes a chapter to "the rise of the nuclear family" in the latter part of his book, The Making of the Modern Family, after he has discussed "traditional society and the family." Stone's latter two family types emphasize the nuclear family in their titles--"The Restricted Patriarchal Nuclear Family," and "The Closed Domesticated Nuclear Family." These three historians' emphasis on communality sociability, and the importance of kinship and lineage in the distant past again gives an impression of a large multi-generational extended family in the past. It has, in fact, been argued that it required the full impact of the Industrial Revolution to complete the evolution from the traditional extended family to the modern nuclear family. Laslett writes:

> It is erroneously believed that it /the family group/ was large because it contained whole groups of kinsfolk living together. The impression seems to be that sons and daughters stayed with their parents after marriage and had their children there: therefore the family group must often have been multi-generational. What after all does patriarchal mean if not the ancient, bearded head of such a family group? It is assumed that when a woman's husband died she returned to her original family group and was supported by it. A widowed mother might live with her married daughter, or a family would support various in-laws. It is also said that there would be extended households of another type, because two married couples would often find it more convenient to share one establishment, just as perhaps they shared one plot of land. In any case, and this seems to be the most deep-seated and important generalization of all, in the familial, patriarchal world the family was the source of welfare. Sickness, unemployment, bereavement were all the responsibility of the family, and so to a large extent was education. To fulfill all these functions the family in the old world would have had to be large. Something like this seems to be the general impression of family life among our ancestors. But their families were not large; at least the average family was relatively small. In fact the evidence we now have suggest that household size was

> remarkably constant in England at 4.75 persons per household at all times from the late sixteenth until the early twentieth century. The general rule which governed the size and constitution of the family has to be laid down. This rule is as follows: no two married couples or more went to make up a family group; whether parents and children, brothers and sisters, employers and servants or married couples associated only for convenience. When a son got married he left the family of his parents and started a family of his own. If he was not in a position to do this, then he could not get married, nor could his sister unless the man who was to take her for his bride was also in a position to start a new family.... Living with in-laws can only have been occasional in the world we have lost. It is impossible that it can have been the ordinary expected thing to do.[46]

The children's books and stories examined here complement Laslett's argument, as the following table indicates:

TABLE 5

NUMBER OF FAMILIES SHARING HOUSEHOLD WITH KIN

a)

Social Class	Number of Families Sharing Household with Kin
Upper	9
Middle	19
Lower	4
Total	32

b)

Social Class	Number of Families Sharing Household with Kin				
	Urban	Rural	Urban/ Rural	Not Given	Total
Upper	2	5	1	1	9
Middle		16	3		19
Lower		4			4
Total	2	25	4	1	32

The average family in the literature was found to consist of 4.41 persons. This figure included relatives as well as parents and children. Family size ranged from 10 members to 2 members. The latter were single parent families with one child. Although in this period of history, social class tended to affect family size--the wealthier families were the largest because their mortality rates for both adults and children were lower--, in the literature, family size was on the whole unaffected by social class.

V. The Household

A differentiation was made between the family, which included parents, children, and related adults and children, and the household, which included both the family as just defined, and all other unrelated adults and children, servants, nurses, governesses, and tutors.

1. Unrelated Adults and Children

Only 3 families shared their home with adults or children other than servants who were unrelated to them either by blood or marriage. For example, in Ashford Rectory (1820), Mr. and Mrs. Villars agreed to take in the children of their wealthy patron when his domestic situation was such that he could not give the children the care and attention they needed. These three families were upper and middle class rural families.

2. Servants

Servants were important members of the household in the nineteenth century. As Marion Lockhead writes in The Victorian Household:

> Servants were a status-symbol, necessary not only to good housekeeping but to self-respect and social dignity. To lack a servant was to pass from genteel poverty, where a light still dimly glowed, into the darkness of vulgarity, among the unknown and unknowable. Poverty might be no disgrace but the loss of gentility was degradation.[47]

So important to the nineteenth century household was the servant, that handbooks were published on the subject. In the pre-Victorian period, two former servants published a handbook entitled The Complete Servant, and it was used, with modifications, throughout the nineteenth century. The book gave a scale of wages relative to the rank of each servant and to the income of the employer. The authors claimed to have written their manual with the help and supervision of a lady of quality.[48] To quote Lockhead:

> /The authors/ suggest spending a quarter of the income on wages except at the lowest rate of income; a widow or a spinster with £100 a year would not spend £25; she would have a girl at five to ten guineas a year. Above that, and for families of husband and wife with children, a scale of wages, with the appropriate number of servants is given. At the £5,000 height there should, for efficiency and dignity, be a staff of twenty-four; eleven females and thirteen males, the latter including the outdoor staff. They would range in dignity from housekeeper down to scullery-maid, from butler to outdoor labourer.[49]

Later in the century, Mrs. Beeton also published a more detailed book on the wages and duties of household servants. Lockhead writes:

> Mrs. Beeton's relation of staff to income gives the £1,000 a year family a cook, upper-and-under housemaids, and a man; at £750; a cook, one maid and a boy; at £500 cook and maid. To employ anything masculine, however diminutive, was the first sign of affluence. At £300 and less, down to £150 there could only be a maid-of-all-work, perhaps only a girl for 'the rough'; the poor widow or spinster with £100 a year must do her own work. Only the grand house, of course, had a head nurse with a nurse-maid under her; the moderate household employed only one.[50]

It is unlikely that a family would have had any difficulty in finding servants. In London alone there were at least ten thousand female servants always looking for a place.[51]

In the literature, 90 families had servants. Only approximate figures can be given for the total number of servants and for the average number of servants per household. In many cases, only one or two servants were actually named or presented, although it was clear from the content of the story that more servants must have been employed. In many cases, the servants appeared and disappeared so casually that one must assume that servants were common, expected, and did not require specific comment or notice. Indeed, it is possible that in the literature the number of families with servants may have been higher. One hundred and ten servants were noted in the literature, an average of 1.22 servants per household. These figures, however, are too low. They are based on the minimum estimate in the respective stories.

The morals of servants were always a source of concern to parents. In the literature, children were frequently admonished to avoid the company of servants, who, it was suspected, might spoil or overindulge children or corrupt their innocence. The First Theft by Mrs. Marshall (1839), was a most effective cautionary story in this respect. A little girl allowed herself to be led astray by an evil servant, and unwittingly helped the servant steal her parents' plate. When the truth eventually emerged, the shock killed the little girl's beloved mamma.

3. Governesses, Tutors, and Nurses

Governesses, tutors and nurses were distinguished from the general group of servants because of their specialized function with respect to children. Also, governesses, and presumably tutors, were of a superior social class than the ordinary servant. As M. Jeanne Peterson writes of the governess:

> If a woman of birth and education found herself in financial distress, and had no relatives who could support her or give her a home, she was justified in seeking the only employment that would not cause her to lose her status. She could find work as a governess.[52]

More is known about the position of the governess in the nineteenth century than that of the tutor. This must in part be due to the interest the Victorians themselves had in the governess. To quote Peterson:

> The governess is a familiar figure to the reader of Victorian novels. Immortalized in Jane Eyre and Vanity Fair, she has frequent appearances as the heroine of many lesser-known novels. And innumerable governesses appear as little more than a standard furnishing in many a fictional Victorian home. While twentieth century acquaintances with the governess may come purely from the novel, the Victorians themselves found her situation and prospects widely discussed, frivolously in Punch, and more seriously in many leading journals of the time....Books on the subject of women as workers, published in growing numbers throughout the Victorian period, devote a large amount of space to the governess.

> The Victorians' interest in the governess went beyond that of entertainment or economic analysis. She was the subject of charitable endeavors, and at least one appeal reveals the sense that the dilemma of the governess was a problem that was expected to touch donors personally: 'there is probably no one who has not some relative or cherished friend either actually engaged in teaching, or having formerly been so engaged.[53]

According to Peterson, there were about 25,000 governesses in England in 1851. Just why the governess received such attention in the nineteenth century, Peterson is at a loss to explain, particularly since there were far more female domestic servants in England at the time--over 750,000. Moreover, the suffering of female laborers in the mines and factories was far greater than that of any governess. Interest in governesses must have stemmed from her ambiguous situation in society, her less than equal position among members of her own class, and the fact that her position, her plight must have touched many members of the middle and upper classes personally. As one mid-Victorian observed:

> The real definition of a governess, in the English sense is a being who is our equal in birth, manners, and education, but our inferior in worldly wealth. Take a lady, in every meaning of the word, born and bred, and let her father pass through the Gazette (bankruptcy), and she wants nothing more to suit our highest beau ideal of a guide and instructress to our children.[54]

And:

> The real discomfort of a governess's position in a private family arises from the fact that it is undefined. She is not a relation, not a guest, not a mistress, not a servant--but something made up of all. No one knows exactly how to treat her.[55]

The condition of the nineteenth century governess is probably best known to the twentieth century reader through the lives and works of the Brontë sisters. Jane Eyre, Charlotte Brontë's masterpiece, portrays the life of a poor but respectable, well-born young woman who takes service as a governess in the house of a wealthy gentleman. The frustration, disappointments and incongruities of her position are described with great feeling by the author, who knows them all too well. She and her sister Anne spent a number of years in wealthy homes, battling loneliness, depression, and ill health, instructing and caring for children they had no real attachment for. Their brother Branwell had an unsuccessful experience as a tutor in the same household as his sister Anne. His personal frustrations are less well known than those of Charlotte, for he lacked a sensitive and sympathetic biographer like Charlotte's Mrs. Gaskell. Yet he too must have felt the incongruities of his position. Cherished by his father and sisters, provided with all the advantages their straitened financial conditions could afford, he must have felt his talents were being wasted in his position as tutor. His less than equal position must have been driven home to him when he was cast aside by the lady of the house with whom he had contracted an illicit relationship. He entertained vain hopes of marriage, but he was not her equal, and he became a bother to her. Lacking his sisters' strength of character, he drowned his frustrations in alcohol and drugs. His sisters spent theirs in literary pursuits.

Unlike Thackeray's fictional Becky Sharp, the unscrupulous little governess in Vanity Fair who found her way into the courts of Europe, the Brontës were not able to use their positions as governesses to improve their social status. Such social climbing was regarded as undesirable by the middle classes.[56] Charlotte Brontë does not allow her governess Jane Eyre to marry her master until their positions are equalized. His position is reduced through personal and financial loss, while hers is improved by means of an unexpected inheritance.

To employ a governess was a mark of gentility. As Peterson writes:

> From at least Tudor times the governess had been part of the households of the upper classes. In the nineteenth century, increasing numbers of governesses were employed by the English middle classes. The governess was a testimony to the economic power of the Victorian middle-class father, as were servants, carriages, and the other 'paraphernalia of gentility'. Although the governess was often behind the scenes and not as conspicuous as other items of genteel equipage, there were ways in which the family could indicate her presence in the home and display her as a symbol of economic power, breeding and station. Drawing room conversations about the governess served to bring her into 'public view'. If she was foreign, her exotic history might be discussed. Even complaining about a governess was a way of 'showing her off'. The governess was also an indicator of the extent to which a man's wife was truly a lady of leisure. The function of the mother had traditionally been, in addition to housewifely duties, that of educator of the children. Both boys and girls in the middle-class family began their education with their mother. Boys were later sent to school or a tutor was hired for them, but girls continued to learn their roles as women from their mothers. Unlike cooking, cleaning, and scrubbing, the education of children was hardly classifiable as manual labour. For this reason the employment of a governess was even more a symbol of the movement of wives and mothers from domestic to ornamental functions. Victorian parents sought a woman who could teach their daughters the genteel accomplishments which were the aims of female education. More important, they sought a gentlewoman.[57]

It is unlikely that the tutor felt the frustrations of his position as keenly as the governess felt hers. Few tutors must have felt that their positions were anything but temporary unless they chose otherwise. As men, they were less restricted by social conditions and ideas of propriety. Moreover, a far greater range of opportunities for respectable employment were available to men than to women in the nineteenth century.

The position of the nurse or nanny in the family and society was far less ambiguous than that of the governess, and in that sense, the nurse's position was preferable. The nurse was a member of the lower classes to begin with, and therefore, her education and expectations would have been far less that those of the governess. She knew her place and accepted it, and she felt no personal, intellectual, or social conflict in her position. As Johnathan Gathorne-Hardy writes in The Rise and Fall of the British Nanny, "governesses... had to be upper class or at least genteel....For nannies and nurses coarser grain was allowed. They were usually working class, the daughters of plasterers, builders, farmers, carpenters, and so on."[58] Thus, as Peterson states:

> It is hardly surprising that 'according to general report, the position of an upper servant in England ...is infinitely preferable to that of a governess'. The servant had the advantage of an unambiguous position, and there was apparently no small comfort in 'knowing one's place'.[59]

As in the case of servants, and for the same reasons, it was not possible to be certain of the exact number of governesses, tutors, or nurses that were employed in the fictional families. It was estimated that 32 families employed at least one of them. The following table indicates the number of nurses, tutors, and governesses employed by each class:

TABLE 6

NURSES, TUTORS AND GOVERNESSES EMPLOYED IN FICTIONAL FAMILIES

Social Class	Nurses	Tutors	Governesses	Other	Total
Upper	10	4	4	0	18
Middle	12	4	4	1 a "bearer"	21
Lower	0	0	0	0	0
Total	22	8	8	1	39

Number of families employing	nurses only	16
"	tutors only	5
"	governesses	5
"	others only	1
"	nurses and tutors	2
"	nurses and governesses	2
"	tutors and governesses	1
Total		32

The extent to which these nurses, tutors, and governesses functioned as surrogate parents in the absence or death of the natural parents cannot be determined with any degree of certainty. Of the 32 families that employed them, half had been or were afflicted with the death or absence of one or both parents. In any case, even when both parents were present, many children, both real and fictional, spent a considerable amount of time in the company of their nurses, tutors, or governesses, "coming down from the nursery well washed and brushed, for an hour of play or reading with mamma."[60] Hopefully, not many children, fictional or otherwise, shared the experience of little Rawdy Crawley in Vanity Fair who saw his mother only when she deigned to enter the nursery once or twice a week. To the boy, his mother was "an unearthly being ...to be worshipped and admired at a distance."[61] She was something of a fairy princess to the lonely, neglected little boy.

4. Pets

Pets cannot be considered members of the household in the proper sense, but they cannot be disregarded. Domestic pets, as well as birds and animals that inhabited the gardens, fields, or woods where children played, were dear playmates of many children. Pets were useful to parents too, since they could become the focal point of many moral tales. Animals could be used to point the way to proper behavior in a light and amusing way. Few children could have resisted something like "The Cat" in The Good Child's Reward by Henry Horsley (1827; 1847):

> Poor Puss, domesticated pretty puss
> Content at home to stay;
> Thy pleasure's shown in gambol tricks,
> And loves to skip and play.
>
> Grateful for every sup of milk,
> And every bit of meat;
> Gives lively proof of gratitude,
> By singing while you eat.
>
> See, how she cleans her sleeky skin?
> A soil would prove a flaw;
> She licks her neck, her sides, her back,
> And don't forget her paw.

Sure her contentment, gratitude,
And cleanliness, will prove
A wholesome lesson unto those
Who are willing to improve.

That child who cannot learn from puss
Must have but little sense;
Mark well her virtues, shun her vice,
And gather good from thence.

That child's most stupid, wicked too,
Who suffers Puss t'excel;
But they who glean good lessons thence,
Will please their parents well.

'Twas God who made thee, pretty Puss,
Thy mews are grateful praise;
I'll learn of thee, and learn betimes,
To walk in wisdom's ways.[62]

As already noted, the robin family in Fabulous Histories by Mrs. Trimmer proved useful to Mrs. Benson and her children for purposes of moral instruction and instruction in natural history. A kitten helped little Soffrona learn a valuable lesson about selflessness in Mrs. Sherwood's tale, Soffrona and her Cat Muff (1828). Pets also proved valuable allies for children. In The Little Woodman and his Dog Caesar, another story by Mrs. Sherwood, a faithful dog rescued his little master from wolves after the little boy had been abandoned in the woods by his wicked elder brothers. Forty-nine families in the literature certainly had pets, and there may have been more. Fourteen of these families were upper class families, 30 were middle class, and 5 were lower class families.

The most popular pets were cats and dogs. Fifteen families had cats, 29 families had dogs. More often than not, little girls had cats and little boys had dogs. Rabbits were the preferred pet in 10 families. Birds were also popular, and quite a variety were made into pets--doves, canaries, ravens, pigeons, chickens, skylarks, pheasants, and robins. Ponies and horses were relatively common. Two asses, two dormice, and one lamb were also considered pets. Admittedly, not all these birds and animals were overly tame, but as long as the children appeared to visit them regularly, to devote special attention to them, observing their habits, and giving them food, it was felt that they could be considered pets.

5. Household Size

The household size, as distinct from the family size, consisted of parents and children as well as all other individuals who lived under the same roof. Approximate figures only can be offered here, largely because of the difficulty experienced in determining exact numbers of servants, governesses, nurses, and tutors in many households. The average household size was estimated to consist of 5.45 individuals. The range was 1 - 14. The largest household was that of a middle class rural family.

Although 5.45 can only be regarded as an approximate figure, it should be noted that it is not out of line with those more scientifically derived figures of Laslett and Shorter. These figures altered only very slightly over the next fifty years. The average household size rose to 4.75. Shorter's figures for Cardington Parish in Bedforshire, 1851 show that there were 6.4 persons in the average farmer's household, and 4.9 persons in the average laborer's household.[63]

Laslett Goodnestone-next-Wingham, Kent April, 1676[64]

Status of Household	No.	Mean Size of Household	Range of Sizes	No.'s of Persons	No.'s of Children	No.'s of Servants	No.'s of Kin
Gentry	3	9.0	22, 3, 2	27	7	15	1
Yeomen	26	5.8	12-2	151	64	34	3
Tradesmen	9	3.9	8-1	35	16	2	0
Labourers	12	3.2	6-2	38	15	0	0
Poor Men	12	2.1	6-1	25	11	0	1
Totals	62	4.45	22-1	276	113	51	5

VI. Conclusion

As it has been demonstrated at many points in this chapter, the information obtained from this selection of children's literature does reflect contemporary historical conditions. The reflection is by no means precise--it cannot be expected to be so. Literature can only give an impression of an age because it is produced out of the thought, experiences, and imagination of the author. Moreover, the author always has a point of view, a definite purpose in writing. In this sense, all literature is didactic. But no author can be separated from his historical period. All literature must touch at some points the age itself. This is why literature is a most valuable, and indeed, essential aid to understanding a particular historical period.

Obviously, some literature offers a clearer, more straightforward impression of an age gone by than others. Didactic children's literature is of this kind. That the demographic data derived from the literature should closely resemble the data obtained from conventional historical sources is not really surprising after all. The writers of didactic fiction for children wished to present moral and behavioral ideals to children. The effectiveness of their presentation would depend on the familiarity of the setting to children. The structural features of the family in didactic children's literature should therefore be expected to correspond generally with contemporary norms. Moreover, writers of this didactic literature were concerned with truth. Fairy tales, fantasies, tales of wonder, were discouraged, lest they excite the child, threaten his moral education, or distract him from the true path of learning and virtue. It is unlikely that one would find anything too far removed from common experience in literature of this kind.

NOTES

[1] Lawrence Stone, *The Family, Sex, and Marriage in England 1500 - 1800* (New York: Harper and Row, 1977), p. 42.

[2] Frederick Joseph Harvey Darton, *Children's Books in England: Five Centuries of Social Life* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1958), p. 234.

[3] Charles Moraze, *The Triumph of the Middle Classes* (New York: Anchor Books, 1968). Moraze has referred to the nineteenth century as the century of the middle class.

[4] G. Kitson Clark, *The Making of Victorian England* (London: Methuen, 1970), pp. 69, 118.

[5] Phyllis Deane, *The First Industrial Revolution* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1975).

[6] Peter Laslett, *The World We Have Lost* (London: Methuen, 1979).

[7] Asa Briggs, *Victorian Cities* (Penguin Books, 1977).

[8] Ibid., p. 59.

[9] Philippe Ariès, *Centuries of Childhood. A Social History of Family Life* (New York: Vintage Books, 1965), pp. 346 - 347.

[10] Ibid., pp. 392-394.

[11] Ibid., p. 398.

[12] Ibid., pp. 398 - 399.

[13] Stone, op. cit., pp. 254-255.

[14] Quoted in E. M. Sigsworth and T. J. Wyke, "A Study of Victorian Prostitution and Veneral Disease," in *Suffer and Be Still: Women in the Victorian Age*, edited by Martha Vicinus (Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Press, 1972), p. 81.

[15] Quoted in Stone, op. cit., p. 256.

[16] Quoted in Marion Lockhead, *The Victorian Household* (London: John Murray, 1964), p. 3.

[17] Lockhead, op. cit., p. 7.

[18] Ibid., pp. 6 - 7.

[19] Jonathan Gathorne-Hardy, The Rise and Fall of the British Nanny (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1972), pp. 57 - 58.

[20] Elizabeth Burton, The Early Victorians at Home 1837 - 1861 (London: Longmans, 1972), p. 95.

[21] Ibid., p. 104.

[22] Ibid., p. 299.

[23] John Ruskin, Praeterita (Oxford University Press, 1978), vol. I, c. II, 38 - 39 (p. 26 - 27). The autobiography was first published in twenty-eight parts between 1885 and 1889.

[24] Ibid., vol. I, c. II, 41 (p. 28).

[25] Deane, op. cit., p. 22.

[26] Laslett, op. cit., pp. 108 - 109.

[27] Ibid., p. 109

[28] Ibid., p. 97.

[29] Ibid., p. 86

[30] Ibid.

[31] E. P. Thompson, The Making of the English Working Class (Penguin Books, 1976), p. 365.

[32] Ibid.

[33] Stone, op. cit., p. 55.

[34] Ibid., pp. 46 - 50.

[35] Ibid., p. 50.

[36] Ibid., p. 60.

[37] Ibid., p. 58.

[38] Ibid.

[39] Laslett, op. cit., p. 109.

[40] Stone, op. cit., pp. 651 - 652.

[41] Thompson, op. cit., pp. 361 - 362.

[42] James Janeway, A Token for Children; being an exact account of the conversion, holy and exemplary lives, and joyful deaths of several young children (London: T. Norris

and A. Bettesworth, 1711), preface. The book was originally published in 1671 and 1672 and republished many times throughout the seventeenth, eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.

[43] Laslett, op. cit., p. 93.

[44] Edward Shorter, The Making of the Modern Family (New York: Basic Books, 1977), p. 30.

[45] Stone, op. cit., p. 60.

[46] Laslett, op. cit., pp. 93 - 95.
Ariès does make it clear in his article, "La Famille," Encounter, XL, V. 2, August 1975, pp. 7 - 12, that he does not believe in the extended family.

[47] Lockhead, op. cit., p. 30.

[48] Ibid.

[49] Ibid., pp. 30 - 31.

[50] Ibid., p. 31.

[51] Burton, op. cit., p. 104.

[52] M. Jeanne Peterson,"The Victorian Governess: Status Incongruence in Family and Society," in Suffer and Be Still, p. 6.

[53] Ibid., p. 3.

[54] Ibid., p. 10.

[55] Ibid., pp. 9 - 10.

[56] Ibid., p. 7.

[57] Ibid., p. 5.

[58] Gathorne-Hardy, op. cit., pp. 71 - 72.

[59] Peterson, op. cit., p. 12.

[60] Lockhead, op. cit., p. 6.

[61] William Makepeace Thackeray, Vanity Fair (Penguin Books, 1980), p. 448. The novel was originally published 1847 - 1848. Vanity Fair is a novel about English society in the Napoleonic Wars and the early nineteenth century.

[62] Henry Sharpe Horsley, The Good Child's Reward.... (London: Thomas Kelly, 1847), pp. 61 - 63. This book was originally published in 1827 under the title, The Affectionate

Parent's Gift and the Good Child's Reward. The text of the later edition was not changed.

[63] Shorter, op. cit., p. 37.

[64] Laslett, op. cit., p. 66.

CHAPTER III

INTERNAL RELATIONSHIPS

CHAPTER III

INTERNAL RELATIONSHIPS

I. Introduction

> This is the true nature of home--it is the place of Peace; the shelter not only from all injury, but from all terror, doubt and division. In so far as it is not this, it is not home; so far as the anxieties of the outer life penetrate into it, and the inconsistently-minded, unknown, unloved, or hostile society of the outer world is allowed by either husband or wife to cross the threshold, it ceases to be home; it is then only a part of that outer world which you have roofed over, and lighted fire in. But so far as it is a sacred place, a vestal temple, a temple of the hearth watched over by Household Gods...so far as it is this, and roof and fire are types only of a nobler shade and light,--shade as of the rock in a weary land, and light as of the Pharos in the stormy sea; so far as it vindicates the name, and fulfils the praise, of Home.[1]

This eulogy by John Ruskin is perhaps the best known of all nineteenth century statements in praise of the home and the family. The Victorian home and family were idealized by the Victorians themselves, and many modern historians have accepted this view, even emphasizing its stable, protective, peaceful nature. Walter E. Houghton in The Victorian Frame of Mind affirmed that the Victorian home was "a rock in the midst of the rushing stream."[2] Other historians, however, while accepting the fact that many Victorians themselves may have regarded the family as the center of life, the home as "the place of Peace; the shelter, not only from all injury, but from all terror, doubt and division," have insisted that not all Victorians in fact found it so. Books like Samuel Butler's

The Way of All Flesh,[3] Edmund Gosse's Father and Son,[4] and indeed, Ruskin's own autobiography, Praeterita,[5] indicate that all was not so peaceful and tranquil in the nineteenth century family. Historians have begun to look beyond the ideal and to explore some of its internal relationships.

Philippe Ariès has suggested in his book, Centuries of Childhood, and later articles about the family and the child, that the family has been (and still is) other than protective and nurturing. In Centuries of Childhood he laments the loss of sociability of the Medieval and Renaissance past, and the consequent impoverishment of social relationships. He writes:

> The family has become an exclusive society in which its members are happy to stay and which they enjoy evoking....This family has advanced in proportion as sociability has retreated. It is as if the modern family had sought to take the place of the old social relationships (as these gradually defaulted), in order to preserve mankind from an unbearable moral solitude. Starting in the eighteenth century, people began defending themselves against a society whose constant intercourse had hitherto been the source of education, reputation, and wealth. Everywhere...private life /was reinforced/ at the expense of neighbourly relationships, friendships, and traditional contacts. The history of modern manners can be reduced in part to this long effort to escape from a society whose pressure had become unbearable. The house lost the public character which it had in certain cases in the seventeenth century, in favour of the club and the café which in turn have become less crowded. Professional and family life have stifled that other activity which once invaded the whole of life: the activity of social relations.[6]

In an article entitled, "The Family, Prison of Love," Ariès carries his argument further and states that the family has been evolving through the centuries into "both an all purpose refuge and a prison."[7] He maintains that the family has turned inward, its members demanding too much of one another.

The parent-child unit has become "intolerably confining."

Stephen Kern sees the nineteenth century family as "an explosive unit" which, by the end of the nineteenth century, was "poised in a tenuous solidity that was already beginning to decompose as the very forces that held it together became too much for individual members to bear."[8] In his article, "Explosive Intimacy: Psychodynamics of the Victorian Family," he states:

> The European family /by/ the late nineteenth century was not the unambiguous shelter from "all terror, doubt and division" that Ruskin eulogized, but was quite often a source of anxiety and conflict....The explosive atmosphere that appears to have crept into so many Victorian families was a function of the excessive intimacy and interdependence that the family imposed upon its members. The family was indeed "fortified" against the pressures of the outside world, as /the historian/ Young argued, but that fortification, like the neurotic defence mechanisms, often stifled more that it protected or comforted. In the course of the nineteenth century, the emotional bonds within the European family mounted steadily, so that by the end of the century, both parents and children began to seek refuge from the forces that held it together with such overbearing intensity....The tightly-knit family imposed itself excessively on the individuals in it....The emotional tone of the Victorian family became one of explosive intimacy in which each of the members were held fast, bound by strong social, economic, and psychological ties.[9]

Similarly, Lawrence Stone, in his discussion of post-1800 family types, maintains that "the family became increasingly 'a stifling fortress of emotional bonding', while relations between parents and children grew more intrusive."[10] In his book, The Fall of Public Man, social psychologist Richard Sennett also deplores "the tyrannies of intimacy," and argues that during the nineteenth century, "the family

/became/...an idealized refuge, a world all its own....a refuge from the terrors of society."[11]

Books like Father and Son and The Way of All Flesh, as well as letters, biographies and autobiographies of prominent individuals such as John Ruskin, the Brontës, and John Stuart Mill give support to the ideas of Ariès, Kern, Stone, Sennett, and others who have tried to explore some of the tensions and contradictions behind the images of peace, tranquillity, and refuge idealized by the Victorians themselves.

It is the purpose of this chapter to contribute to this exploration of the image of the family as a refuge, a fortress, a place of peace, by examining the relationships within the family as presented in books written for children, the form in which the image was presented to those who reached adulthood in the Victorian era. The emphasis here, however, will be on the presentation and discussion of evidence, rather than on supporting a particular theory or theories. It is necessary, and a worthwhile exercise in its own right, to consider whether or not evidence of this sort can support or challenge current interpretations of the nineteenth century family. The first part of the chapter will focus on the dominant figure in the fictional family, the center of authority and influence. The remaining parts of the chapter will focus specifically on the character of the relationships between members of the family: spouses, parents and children, and siblings. The relationship between didactic children's literature, contemporary sources, and current interpretations of family history will be discussed in the conclusion.

II. The Center of Authority and Influence

It was not difficult to determine which character in the fictional families was the center of authority and influence. This was the individual to whom all members of the family ultimately deferred. Ideally, he or she was a character endowed with great moral fortitude, firmness of mind and spirit, superior wisdom and understanding. This character, particularly if male, tended to appear aloof or detached from the family itself as befitting a figure of authority. This character was not always the one most involved in the day-to-day affairs of the household, but he or she had the final word in all matters pertaining to the interests and welfare of the family and the household. Mr. Fairchild in Mrs. Sherwood's book, The History of the Fairchild Family was one of the best examples of such a character. In the following incident, the great authority and influence he wielded within his family is illustrated by the way in which all members of his family and household accepted unquestioningly and even supported his decision to punish his small son Henry for disobedience.

> "I stand in the place of God to you, whilst you are a child; and as long as I do not ask you to do anything wrong, you must obey me: therefore, if you cast aside my authority, and will not obey my commands, I shall not treat you as I do my other children. From this time forward, Henry, I have nothing to do with you: I shall speak to you no more, neither will your mamma, or sisters, or John, or Betty...."

> Henry looked surprised and frightened; but he had no time to answer, for Mr. Fairchild walked away with a terrible look, and went out of the house...Whilst [Henry] was thinking what he should do, Lucy came out of the parlour, and passed to go upstairs. "Lucy, Lucy," said Henry; but, instead of answering him, she ran away as fast as possible. In a few minutes Emily came out of the garden with the hare's parsley, and was bringing it into the study; but seeing Henry, she turned back in haste. He caught hold of her frock, and said, "Emily! dear Emily! Will you too run away from me?" She pulled her frock out of his hand and made him no answer, because her father had forbidden her to speak to him....He then took [his lesson] to his mamma who was sitting in the parlour: she was reading, and did not see him come in. He walked softly up to her, and in a humble voice said "Mamma, I can say my lesson; please to hear me."--"No, Henry," she answered in a grave and sorrowful voice, "you have rebelled against your father, and I have nothing to say to you till you have obtained his pardon: go away!"....[Henry] ran out into the garden; and...he broke out into a violent burst of tears, crying, "What shall I do? What shall I do? Oh, Papa! Oh, Mamma! Oh, Lucy! Oh, Emily!" Though he cried so loud, nobody came to comfort him; and though John [the servant] passed not far distant, he took no notice of his cries.[12]

The husband or father was the center of authority and influence in 73 of the 119 fictional families examined. Where the father was not ~~the~~ center of authority and influence, there was a definite well-known and understood reason: absence, illness, or death. In these cases, the mother, an elder son, or a close male relative filled the position. The mother was the center of authority and influence in 24 families, a relative the dominant figure in 12 families. In 3 families, the father entrusted his children to the care of a relative who then became temporarily the center of authority and influence in the story. In 7 families the center of authority and influence could not be determined because of insufficient information or inapplicability. In a number of stories, even if the father was not actually present, his dominance was acknowledged. For example, although Mr. Benson was absent throughout Mrs. Trimmer's book, Fabulous Histories, his authority and influence was acknowledged by his wife and children. As Mrs. Benson explained to her young son during a lesson on the habits of bees:

> There is something very wonderful, said Mrs. Benson, in the strong attachment these little creatures have to their sovereign, and very instructive too. I wish our good King could see all his subjects so closely united in his interest! What say you, Frederick, would you fight for your King? Yes mamma, if papa would--That I assure you, my dear, he certainly would do, if there were occasion, and as loyally as the best bee in the world; and I beg you will remember what I now tell you as long as you live; that it is your duty to love your King, for he is to be considered as the father of his country. But mamma, said Frederick, it is the Queen that the bees love and we have a queen too. Yes my dear, we have so; and I believe her majesty is as much honoured by her subjects as a queen bee in her hive, though she has not so full a command over them; for it is a king that governs England as your papa governs his family, and the queen is to be considered as the mother of the country.[13]

This single passage reveals much about the internal structure of the pre-Victorian family. The association of the paterfamilias with the king, the highest authority in the nation is important. The father could demand from his family, as the king could demand from his subjects, duty, respect, loyalty, and submission. The father of the family, by his association with the king, could share all the symbolism, religious as well as secular, vested in the latter. The king, although no longer considered to rule by divine right, was nonetheless, Defender of the Faith, head of the Church of England, and guardian of the rights and privileges of the Church. His coronation was a religious occasion as well as one of state. One can easily see the chain of association: God, king, father. Society was perceived in terms of a series of families, and the perception was faithfully reproduced in didactic children's literature.

It is hardly surprising that the father became identified with God Himself. Indeed, little children were actually encouraged to think of their father in this way. As Mr. Fairchild told little Henry in The History of the Fairchild Family, "I stand in the place of God to you." Similarly, Mr. Dalben told his young ward in The History of Henry Milner:

> The Almighty, who knows the foolishness and sinfulness of children, has in his infinite mercy given to each little child some kind friend, or parent, in whose hands an awful authority and responsibility is invested, directing that this authority shall be used for the child's good, until that child has attained an age in which he may be supposed to understand the higher obligations of religion. The Almighty, in this arranging matters for little children, and directing in his holy book, that the chastisements of various kinds should be used if needful, plainly pointed out, that he did not expect persons at a very early period of life to be regulated by argument or reason, but by parental authority; and therefore, those parents who neglect the use of power thus placed in their hands, are as guilty of despising the ordinance of God as he who refuses to enter a place of worship or denies the authority of the divine precepts concerning the Sacraments.[14]

As this passage indicates, the father's authority stemmed from God. Some of that divine authority was shared with his wife. For example, one girl's guardian stated in Mrs. Sherwood's book, Susannah:

> I am to stand in the place of a parent to you, and all the duties you owed to your own dear parents, now no more, you owe to me. I am, therefore, to be considered by you, as long as you live with me, as a mother, and I wish you to tell me from whom a mother receives

> her authority over her child. I hesitated a little, and then said from God.[15]

Although the father's position was awesome indeed, it must be noted that he was expected to use his authority wisely and judiciously. In the ideal family at least, the tyrant was not admired. As Ann Taylor stated in the conclusion of her book, The Family Mansion:

> The domestic tyrant, he who can rule with a rod of iron the weak and defenceless beings whom by every tie, human and divine, he is bound to cherish and protect; and who, by his harsh and overbearing conduct, is the terror, instead of the tender guardian and solace of his family, may be generally classed among the incurables. There are those who pride themselves upon what they call their prerogative, in being, as they term it, masters of their own houses, while they are not masters of themselves; and who are so partial to that title, that they forget those of husband and father; but while such rulers enjoy their unenviable sway, let them know they must never hope to experience the genuine pleasures and rational delights of a Family Mansion.[16]

III. Husband-Wife Relationships

As the husband and father was the center of authority and influence in the majority of fictional families, it follows that he was accorded the superior position in almost all the marital relationships presented in the literature. Fifty-four husbands compared to only one wife held the superior position in the marital relationship. In only 4 marriages were the relationships considered equal. Sixty relationships could not be categorized because of insufficient information or inapplicability. This last large number reflects the appallingly high mortality rate among adults in this period of history. As noted in the previous chapter, both parents were present and living in the home in only 61 families.

As in establishing the center of authority and influence in a family, it was not difficult to determine the dominant partner in the marital relationship. The dominant partner made all major decisions pertaining to the interests and welfare of the family from matters of finance, location of residence, to details of discipline, education and recreation. For example, in What Trade Shall I Be? it was the husband and father of the family, the character who was both the center of authority and influence in the family and the dominant partner in the marital relationship, who decided the family would emigrate to Canada, the "land of promise" in order to improve its fortunes. The dominant character in the relationship was usually indicated very early in the story, even in the first paragraphs. For example, the introductory paragraph of Mrs. Sherwood's The History of the Fairchild Family provided important information about the nature of Mr. and Mrs. Fairchild's relationship:

> Mr. and Mrs. Fairchild lived very far from any town: their house stood in the midst of a garden, which in the summer time was full of fruit and sweet flowers. Mr. Fairchild kept only two servants, Betty and John: Betty's business was to clean the house, cook the dinner, and milk the cow; and John waited at table, worked in the garden, fed the pig, and took care of the meadow in which the cow grazed.[17]

Mr. Fairchild's dominance was established in this paragraph. He was the one who was said to "keep" the servants, and presumably, he supervised household expenditures. The house itself was usually referred to in the book as "Mr. Fairchild's house." Mr. Fairchild was clearly the proprietor:

> Near Mr. Fairchild's house there was a little green hill, at the top of which were some beautiful chestnut trees; and, under the chestnut trees was a little seat, which Mr. Fairchild, with John's help, had placed there....From the top of this hill you could see Mr. Fairchild's house, standing in the pleasant garden....[18]

Although both Mr. and Mrs. Fairchild told their three children stories, helped them with their lessons, and heard their confessions, it was usually Mr. Fairchild who initiated family excursions:

> "It is a fine morning, my little ones," said Mr. Fairchild one day to his children; "we will take a walk to the top of the hill, and sit there under the shade of the trees; and there we will talk about God, and we will sing a hymn in praise of God." Then Lucy, and Emily, and Henry ran joyfully to put on their hats and tippets; and, when their mamma was ready, they set out.[19]

As these examples indicate, Mr. Fairchild's position as the center of authority and influence in the family carried over into his relationship with his wife. This occurred in other fictional families where the husband and father was the center of authority and influence.

In the four families in which the marital relationship was characterized by equality rather than superiority of one sex over the other, the wives and mothers were perceived to be highly moral women of very strong character. They appeared in The Two Mothers by Mrs. Cameron (1824), Emily and Henrietta by William Sullivan (1818), Amendment by Catherine Parr Traill and Susanna Moodie (1828), and Gertrude by Eliza White (1823). In all but Amendment, their relationships with their husbands could be characterized as loving and supportive. In Amendment the relationship was perceived to be ambivalent. In the one book where a dominant wife appeared, The Fruits of Education by Mrs. Cameron, Mrs. Danvers was a self-indulgent, pleasure-loving woman, who cared little for anyone but herself. Her husband was a colorless, insignificant individual, physically and spiritually weak. Their relationship with one another appeared to be characterized by indifference. Mr. and Mrs. Danvers were presented for criticism, not for imitation.

Clearly, male superiority and female submissiveness in the marital relationship were perceived to be the proper order of things. Children's literature accurately reflected and even promoted this view. For example, in Memoirs of Emma and her Nurse (1825), Mrs. Cameron described Lady Harewood in one incident as showing "the sweet silence of subjection which graces the Christian wife and the gentle readiness to oblige."[20] In The Victorian Frame of Mind 1830 - 1870 Walter E. Houghton notes:

> Of the...conceptions of women current in the Victorian period, the best known is that of the submissive wife whose whole excuse for being was to honour, obey--and amuse--her lord and master, and to manage her household and bring up his children. In that role her character and her life were completely distinct from his:
>
> "Man for the field and woman for the hearth;
> Man for the sword, and for the needle she;
> Man to command, and woman to obey;
> All else confusion.[21]

Women were considered physically and psychologically subordinate to men. This subordination was sanctioned by law.[22]

Oddly enough, although the Victorians demanded submission from women, women were revered. The respectable, dutiful wife and mother was no less than "the angel in the house," or so the poet Coventry Patmore claimed in a work dedicated to his own wife.[23] Ruskin's eulogy of the home quoted at the beginning of this chapter, concluded with praise for the wife:

> And wherever a true wife comes, this home is always around her. The stars only may be above her head, the glow-worm in the night-cold grass, may be the only fire at her foot, but home is wherever she is; and for a noble woman it stretches far around her, better than ceiled with cedar or painted with vermillion, shedding the quiet light for those who else were homeless.[24]

Unfortunately, Ruskin did not find in his own wife this "true wife." His marriage was annulled amid some scandal, as a few of the more intimate details of his relationship with his wife became known to the public.[25] Nonetheless, Ruskin expressed in eloquent terms the opinion of the majority of Victorians. He believed that the sexes were complementary opposites, and he assigned each a separate character and scope of endeavor:

> Now their separate characters are briefly these. The man's power is active, progressive, defensive. He is eminently the doer, the creator, the discoverer, the defender. His intellect is for speculation and invention; his energy for adventure, for war and for conquest....But the woman's power is for rule, not for battle and her intellect is not for invention or recreation, but sweet ordering, arrangement, and decision. She sees the qualities of things, their claims, and their places. Her great function is praise, she enters into no contest, but infallibly adjudges the crown of contest. By her office and place, she is protected from all danger and temptation. The man, in his rough work in the open world must encounter all peril and trial--to him therefore must be the failure, the offence, the inevitable error; often he must be wounded or subdued, often misled, and always hardened.[26]

This order outlined by Ruskin was accepted by men and women alike. It was the natural way of things, ordered by

God. As will be seen in the chapter on education, boys and girls learned about their separate natures at an early age. Girls were taught as soon as possible to be submissive, deferent, and dutiful to their fathers and brothers. As one mother wrote to her daughter in Correspondence Between a Mother and Her Daughter at School by Ann and Jane Taylor (1817), "You my dear Laura, have been trained from your childhood in habits of proper subordination."[27] Similarly, boys learned that their role was to guide and protect their mothers and sisters. Thus a father told his tearful son on the eve of the latter's first departure from home to attend school in Always Happy!!! by Maria Budden (1814; 1820; 1823):

> Dear boy, my dear boy, these tears are due to the most excellent of mothers and the most affectionate of sisters.--I would not have you to part from them with indifference. So far from it, I would have you bear their remembrance incessantly in your heart.--The recollection of their virtues will soften and improve your character, whilst the claims they have upon you, will keep you steady in the path of rectitude.--Your name is theirs, do not, therefore, forget that by staining your character, you will also cloud theirs.[28]

Women, weak, dependent, yet "scarcely mortal," to use Houghton's phrase, were to be cherished, guided, protected, and controlled by men. Their lives rested in the hands of their protectors. The following passage from a letter in Correspondence is an example of the way in which children were taught in the literature written for them, to revere the home and the female sex, and to understand the separate characters of men and women and their separate spheres of activity:

> You are returning home. It is a comprehensive word, my dear Laura: upon your right estimation of its value greatly depends your future happiness. It is chiefly there that the lustre of the female character is discernible; because home is its proper sphere. Men have much to do with the world without; our field of action is circumscribed; yet, to confine ourselves within its humble bounds, and to discharge our duties there, may produce effects equally beneficial and extensive with their wider range.[29]

The major difference between this passage and John Ruskin's description of the separate characters of men and women is that the former was written by two women for children in 1817, the latter was written by a respected man of letters for adults in 1865.

The domination of one marriage partner over the other did not necessarily produce an intolerable situation in the literature. Domination did not necessarily mean tyranny, and indeed, as Ann Taylor indicated in The Family Mansion, tyrants were not to be admired. Tyrants would never "experience the genuine pleasures and rational delights of a Family Mansion." In other words, the tyrant would never know the joy and comfort to be found within the bosom of a happy, loving family. The father deserving of respect and admiration was one who was the "tender guardian and solace of his family."

Although the husband was the dominant one in the marital relationships portrayed in the literature, his relationship with his wife was perceived to be loving and supportive in the overwhelming majority of cases where sufficient information was available. A total of 43 marital relationships appeared to be loving and supportive, 6 were considered indifferent, and 7 ambivalent. None of the relationships were considered hostile. It was not possible to categorize the marital relationships in 63 fictional families because of insufficient evidence or inapplicability due to the death or absence of a spouse.

A marital relationship was considered loving and supportive if both partners treated one another with respect, consideration, and affection. A good example of this kind of relationship was presented in Always Happy!!! by Maria Budden. The following passage begins with little Serena's observation to her father that her dear mother seemed to be ailing. Her father's reply indicates the character of the marital relationship:

> "/Mamma/ has sprained her arm, my dear," said her father, tenderly, "but it is getting better,--it will soon be well.--"Sprained her arm," repeated Serena, sorrowfully, "when did that happen.--"In your illness." --"Yes, I dare say with holding me so many hours; but she never complained."--"No, my love, it would have grieved you, your mother seldom thinks of herself, never, when another is to be thought of."--How good she is, how very good."--"She has a firm mind, Serena, which conquers self, and makes her feel only for others. Copy her fortitude, my dear child; fortitude will give value to all your other virtues."--Her mother now approached, Serena threw herself into her arms, and sobbed out her love,--her gratitude. Her parents tenderly embraced her--It was a happy scene, such as we all of us have in turn felt, but which we can never properly describe.[30]

Gentleness, kindness, and even tenderness, apparently were not thought to be incompatible with the authoritarianism characteristic of the nineteenth century paterfamilias.

Another aspect to be noted of this kind of relationship is the way in which husband and wife shared similar views of methods of child-rearing and upheld one another's decisions when discipline was necessary. It will be recalled that when disobedient, wilful little Henry approached his mother seeking attention not long after his quarrel with his father in The History of the Fairchild Family, she showed her support for her husband's method of discipline by saying "in a grave and sorrowful voice,", "No, Henry...you have rebelled against your father, and I can have nothing to say to you until you have obtained his pardon: go away!"[31]

As the figures indicate, few relationships appeared indifferent or ambivalent. Those that did were relationships set up for purposes of contrast or moral example. The families portrayed were adversely affected by the unfortunate parental relationship. The families were not stable, protective, and nurturing. The children showed a greater tendency to exhibit such undesirable behaviors as wilfulness, disobedience, selfishness, and frivolousness. A relationship appeared indifferent if the husband and wife showed little interest in one another's activities, and little concern or consideration for one another's wishes or needs. Characteristically, husband and wife demonstrated little or no affection for one another, and each was concerned primarily with pursuing individual goals. Mr. and Mrs. Danver's relationship in The Fruits of Education was considered indifferent. He was a nondescript character, morally and spiritually weak, while she was a selfish, vain, frivolous, pleasure-loving woman. Mrs. Danvers showed little respect or consideration for her husband, and assumed the dominant position in the household. Mr. Danvers in turn showed little interest in her or her activities. He appeared not to care that his wife controlled the household. Unfortunately, the nature of their relationship affected Mrs. Danver's motherless young cousin Maria, who had been left in their care. The girl became selfish, vain, and frivolous through want of proper guidance. She clearly lacked a stable, nurturing family environment.

In ambivalent relationships, the husband and wife showed some signs of affection or at least interest in one another, but such consideration frequently gave way to dislike and even outright scorn. There was a tendency towards competition for the control and affection of the children, particularly if both parents were strong willed or determined characters like Mr. and Mrs. Grant in Amendment by Catherine Parr Traill and Susanna Moodie. In this story, Mr. Grant was a self-indulgent, disreputable man, while his wife was a highly moral and pious woman. Mr. Grant appeared to respect his wife, although he did everything he could to thwart her attempts to promote piety, industry, and obedience in their little son. Mrs. Grant struggled to counteract his influence on their son, and to win her husband over to virtue.

Of course, a warm, loving, and supportive relationship between husband and wife, such as the one noted in Always Happy!!!, was recognized to be ideal for the nurture of children. No doubt this is why this kind of relationship predominated in the literature, and why it was emphasized by didactic writers. A strong relationship between the parents helped buttress the family against the world and facilitated the teaching of desired virtues. It should be noted briefly that the characteristics of marital relationships appeared to be unaffected by such considerations as social class, occupation, and urban or rural living conditions. The reason for this would seem to be due to the very nature of the didactic literature itself. Concerned to present an image of the family, an image to instruct or encourage emulation, didactic writers were interested primarily in the ideal relationship. The ideal relationship should be unaffected by such external considerations as social class, and economic status. Those virtues which contributed to the growth and maintenance of an ideal relationship came from within the individuals themselves and derived from their relationship with God. Goodness, piety, honor, duty and devotion were found in all classes as were cruelty, tyranny, irresponsibility, and irreverence. The poor dairyman and his wife enjoyed a loving and supportive relationship despite their low status in Legh Richmond's book, The Dairyman's Daughter. It was a relationship much superior to that noted of Mr. and Mrs. Grant, who belonged to the upper class in Amendment.

IV. Parent-Child Relationships

1. Parental Types

The relationship between the husband and wife is the primary relationship in a family. To a greater or lesser extent, all other relationships are affected by the character of the primary one. Prior to examining the nature of the parent-child relationship in the literature, parental types will be considered. Three categories were established: hostile/punitive, supportive/helping, and paternalistic/maternalistic.

The hostile/punitive parent was considered to be one who showed open hostility toward the child and punished readily and severely.[32] In the sample of children's literature examined here, the hostile/punitive parent was a rare character. In fact, in only one story, Amendment by Catherine Parr Traill and Susanna Moodie, was the father considered hostile and punitive. In this story the father was also presented as totally disreputable, dishonest, and cowardly. He abandoned his two motherless children in order to flee his creditors. Interestingly enough, the hostile/punitive mother appeared more frequently than the father. In The Good Grandmother and her Offspring by Barbara Hofland (1817), the mother was a lazy, slovenly, self-indulgent character, who showed little interest in her children except to punish them. The real functions of a mother were performed instead by her mother-in-law, the children's grandmother. Two other examples of hostile/punitive mothers were found in Susannah by Mrs. Sherwood. Two of the three guardians, mother figures to the orphaned Susannah, were hostile/punitive characters. The first was a severe and eccentric woman who did not appear to like or understand children. The second guardian was another self-indulgent, careless, and indolent woman who found children a burden and a nuisance. It is clear from these examples that the hostile/punitive parent was introduced for purposes of criticism. Hostile/punitive parents were hardly to be respected or emulated.

Six fathers and 11 mothers were considered supportive/helping. Parents who were considered supportive/helping were generally more tolerant of their children's behavior than the other parental types. Supportive/helping parents appeared to have a closer relationship with their children as well. There was some tendency among supportive/helping parents to indulge their children, which no doubt explains why this parental type was not popular with many didactic writers. It must be stressed that the supportive/helping parent discussed here bears no similarity to the kind of parent described by deMause in his "helping mode."[33]

Mr. Hervey in Education at Home by Edgar White Benson (1824) was a supportive/helping parent. He was not an overly indulgent father, but he was more tolerant of his sons' behavior than many other fathers presented in the literature. The anxieties and concerns of childhood were as important to Mr. Hervey as those of adulthood. Childish misdemeanors were corrected firmly, but gently. There was a closeness between Mr. Hervey and his children that did not exist between Mr. Fairchild and his children. Mr. Hervey's relationship with his children is described in the introduction of the book:

> Mr. Hervey's fortune was a moderate competency, sufficient to procure all the necessaries, and some of the elegancies of life; though he had two sons, he was by no means anxious to increase it, as he believed, that in watching over the education of his children, he was

> contributing in a greater degree to their future happiness, than by accumulating wealth, and leaving their minds to be trained by dependents. In dedicating much of his time to their instruction, Mr. Hervey felt himself amply repaid by their increased attachment. To their father they always applied in all their sorrows for advice and consolation; and in all their pleasures his sympathetic smile was looked for. The hour before retiring to rest was to them the happiest in the day. It was invariably spent along with him; in summer, in walking; in winter, in the library. It was passed in reading, in trying amusing experiments, or in conversations which generally arose out of some previous event of the day.[34]

The poor dairyman in Legh Richmond's book, The Dairyman's Daughter a man of vastly different social circumstances than Mr. Hervey, was also considered supportive and helping as was his wife. These two parents, recognizing their daughter's devotion to God, supported her and encouraged her in her pious activities and even allowed her to become their mentor.

In a number of stories, the supportive/helping parent, particularly the mother, was somewhat dependent on the child for moral and spiritual support, as in the case of The Dairy-Man's Daughter, or for economic support. Examples of dependency occurred in Claudine by Maria Budden (1822), The History of Farmer Darwin and his Family by A. Selwyn, Sophia by Mrs. Cameron, and The Little Cowslip Gatherers by Esther Copley (1824). In these stories, the relationship between the parents and children was close and based on mutual respect as well as need. Although parental authority was never dismissed in stories involving supportive/helping parental types, it was not emphasized to nearly the same extent it was in stories where the parental types were hostile/punitive or paternalistic/maternalistic. In The History of the Fairchild Family by

Mrs. Sherwood and The Little Prisoner by Catherine Parr Traill and Susanna Moodie, for example, incidents demanding a display of parental authority were deliberately introduced by the authors. It is interesting to note that in families where parental authority was not overly emphasized in parent-child relations, there was much less emphasis on behavioral problems among the children. By and large, in families where one or both parents were supportive and helping, the children were respectful, obedient, resourceful, and industrious.

Two fictional parents, both mothers, were considered simply indulgent rather than supportive/helping because they lacked even minimal control over their children. The results were predictable. In Elizabeth Somerville's book, James Manners, Little John and their Dog Bluff (1818), little James was spoiled by an overly indulgent mother. Unruly as a child, James grew up to be a cruel, indolent young man with an addiction to gambling. Fortunately, through the wise efforts of an uncle and the good example of John, the son of a worthy tenant farmer, James was reformed and he became a reputable gentleman. The author felt compelled to state the moral of her story in a preface:

> In writing the following sheets, I have endeavored to delineate the ill effects of false indulgence, by which all due respect to parents is destroyed, and children, led to consider themselves the first object become discontented with everything around them, and wearisome to themselves. As their years increase, the evil becomes more serious, for being accustomed to unlimited gratification, they rush, with the warmth and inexperience of youth, into the vortex of vice.[35]

Another example of an indulgent mother occurred in the third of Amelia Stubb's collection of stories, Family Tales for Children (1824).

Ann Taylor presented a mother who was both indulgent and indifferent in her book, The Family Mansion. In this story, a young man made an imprudent marriage. His wife was a frivolous, indolent woman who alternately spoiled and neglected their children. One child died due to the neglect of the servants, while the remaining child, a girl, was brought up unwisely, left largely to the care of servants. Vain, frivolous, spoiled, her head filled with romantic ideas as a result of her faulty upbringing, the girl married unwisely. Although the girl suffered for her rashness, she was able to profit from her experience and grow in strength and fortitude. The author did provide a happy ending.

It might be noted in passing that such stories as James Manners and The Family Mansion displayed a wonderful faith on the part of the authors in human ability to overcome the disadvantages of a less than favourable upbringing. Perhaps this faith can be regarded as part of a general growing optimism and belief in human progress which came to characterize the nineteenth century society.

The preferred parental type, judging from its predominance in the literature, was the paternalistic/maternalistic type. Sixty-two fathers and 63 mothers were considered paternalistic/maternalistic, a significant number when it is recalled that there were only 80 fathers and 82 mothers present and living in the home for the greater part of the story.[36] Although paternalistic and maternalistic parental types tended to be associated with masculinity and femininity respectively, they did share certain similarities. Both types were characteristically authoritarian. They gave their children love and support conditionally. That is, provided their children fulfilled certain conditions, such as demonstrating due docility, humility, obedience, and industry in their behavior, they would receive the benefits of parental love and support. Failure to live up to parental expectations would result in the immediate withdrawal of love and support. Richard Sennett offers a similar description of paternalism in his recent book, Authority:

> One definition of an authority is precisely someone who will use his strength to care for others....Paternalistic authorities hold out a false love to their subjects. False because the leader cares for these subjects only insofar as it serves his interests. Unlike a patrimonial figure, he makes a gift of his resources to others. The terms of this gift are wholly in his control. /A paternalistic figure/ is willing to make the gift only on the condition that his charges be gratefully passive....There is no tolerance of their crankiness, no willingness to sacrifice himself--above all no encouragement of their independence....There is a promise of nurturance made in paternalistic ideologies, and the essential quality of nurturance is denied: that one's care will make another person grow stronger.[37]

The predominance of this parental type in nineteenth century children's literature is perhaps to be expected, for as Sennett demonstrates, paternalism characterized more than just parent-child relationships at this time. It characterized most human relationships which involved an exercise of authority. It was part of a general nostalgia for the past and an ideal past at that. "The era of high capitalism," as Sennett calls it, destroyed what was familiar and safe in the lives of nineteenth century men and women.

> Everywhere in the nineteenth century the fragments of the old life which capitalism was shattering were being picked up and treasured as objects all the more precious because they were so vulnerable, too delicate to survive the onslaught of material progress....The stable family, with the younger generations taking their places in the order custom dictated, was idealized as the seat of virtue.[38]

Because the new was unsettling and only imperfectly understood, there was an attempt to employ old and familiar images. The family, parental authority, were both familiar and understood. Many persisted in seeing society in terms of family and parental images because they represented stability and security in a rapidly changing world. As Sennett emphasizes, "the need for authority is basic." He writes:

> Children need authorities to guide and reassure them. Adults fulfill an essential part of themselves in being authorities; it is one way of expressing care for others. There is a persistent fear that we will be deprived of this experience....Desires for guidance, security, and stability do not disappear when they are unsatisfied.[39]

Sennett argues that the authority and domination characteristic of the paternalistic figure is based on that figure's role as a protector, a stern judge, and a figure of strength.[40] The paternalistic figure is often endowed with omniscience. He may be clothed with an aura of divinity, for indeed, as noted above, the nineteenth century child was encouraged to regard his father as standing in the place of God.[41]

Children did of course rebel against such authority in the didactic literature. But since didactic writers were concerned to emphasize happy, devoted families, not families torn asunder in revolt, rebellious children were only introduced for specific purposes either as a contrast to happy, submissive, obedient children, or to show the evolution of a character. A child sometimes appeared initially rebellious in a story in order to show the beneficient effects of the influence of a worthy adult. Many books written for children at this time made use of this theme. Sometimes the theme was emphasized in the subtitles as in Ashford Rectory; or, The Spoiled Child Reformed by Frances Jamieson. In this story, the worthy Reverend and Mrs. Villars agreed to provide a home for the two children of their wealthy patron while the latter and his wife were abroad. The eldest child, although at first spoiled and vain, was gradually reformed by the good influences of the happy Villars family who reformed him and saved him from the consequences of an unpleasant and unhappy disposition. Catherine Parr Traill and Susanna Moodie used the same theme in Amendment. In this story, Charles, a vain, selfish, rebellious boy and his sister were abandoned by their dissipated, disreputable father shortly after their mother died. The children's nurse, a poor woman, could make a home for only one of the children. Naturally she chose the little girl, a good, industrious child with a sweet disposition. Charles did find a friend in Giles the cow-boy. Giles, although mistreated by Charles in the past, shared his food and his bed with his young master. Charles, overwhelmed by the kindness of the cow-boy, abandoned his rebellious, aggressive behavior, and became humble and industrious. His transformation was permanent and did not alter, even when a wealthy uncle appeared to make a home for him and his sister. Similarly, The Little Prisoner, subtitled Passion and Patience, another book by Traill and Moodie, traced the development of Ferdinand from a passionate, bad-tempered boy, to a quiet, submissive and dutiful boy.

The theme of rebellious children reformed was thus a popular one in children's literature. It can be regarded as a more optimistic theme than that which characterized some children's literature, particularly that of an earlier period, where themes of depravity, damnation, and Hell predominated. There was no hope for rebellious children in the works of writers like James Janeway.[42] In the stories just noted, there was indeed hope for children. A rebellious child was not necessarily doomed to eternal damnation and suffering. He could be reformed. Children's literature in the pre-Victorian period then does reflect something of the Arminianism popularized by John Wesley in the latter part of the eighteenth century.

Alongside this optimism, however, was great emphasis on control. Children's behavior had to be controlled. In these stories, rebellion and uncontrolled behavior were never successful. There was never any sense of escape from control in didactic children's literature as there was in some adult literature, as for example, in Edmund Gosse's book, Father and Son.[43] No child in this didactic literature ever knew the feeling of relief, the sense of worth experienced by Gosse when he finally escaped the stifling control of his father. Philip Gosse, the father, was and is an excellent example of the paternalistic parental type.[44]

As Sennett emphasizes throughout his book, the need for authority is basic. Human beings of all ages need authority. Although both adults and children need love and support, in the case of children, this need is felt more acutely. Naked authority can frighten children. It needs to be rendered more reasonable, less fearful, and thus, ironically, it also becomes more effective. The withdrawal of love and support, just those things which make authority seem more reasonable, less fearful because they offer at the same time the possibility of comfort, was an effective way of bringing rebellious children back into control. The threat of losing that much needed comfort, that love and support without which parental authority was too frightening to contemplate, was enough to crush rebellion in all but the most hardened hearts. It effectively crushed rebellion in little Henry when he refused to learn his Latin in The History of the Fairchild Family:

> As soon as breakfast and prayers were over, Mr. Fairchild went into the study, and calling Henry to him, asked him to repeat his lesson; but Henry would not say even one word. Mr. Fairchild shut the Grammar, and, laying it down, said, "Henry, I know that you could have learned this lesson with ease yesterday morning before eleven o'clock. Tell me now wherefore you would not?"
> "I don't want to learn Latin," said Henry.
> "But it is my pleasure that you should," said Mr. Fairchild, "and I expect to be obeyed. Tell me now at once, will you learn this lesson or not?"

> Henry made no answer.
> Mr. Fairchild got up, and walked up and down the room in great trouble; then, turning to Henry, he said, "Henry, listen to me: When wicked men obstinately defy and oppose the power of God, he gives them up to their own hard hearts: he suffers them to love, perhaps and partake of the light of the sun and of the fruits of the earth, but he shews them no marks of his Fatherly love or favour; they have no sweet thoughts, no cheerful hours, no delightful hopes.

Mr. Fairchild then reminded Henry that he stood in the place of God to his son, and as God put aside those wicked ones who stubbornly defied Him, so Mr. Fairchild would have nothing to do with his son:

> If you cast aside my authority, and will not obey my commands, I shall not treat you as I do my other children. From this time forward, Henry, I have nothing to do with you....[45]

Little Henry was virtually isolated from all those he loved, his parents, his sisters, the family servants. He was ostracized, denied the warmth, protection, comfort, love and support of the family. Little Henry became acutely aware of his loneliness, his insecurity and vulnerability as he watched his family set out for a walk without him:

> Henry staid in /the/ arbour, sobbing and crying, about half an hour: then going out at a back gate, he went out into the lane, and turned to go up the little round hill, because from the top of that hill he could see everyone who came in and went out of his papa's house. There he sat down on the bench under the trees, with his eyes fixed on the dear home. All about him was quite silent: there was no sound, except the buzzing of flies and the distant lowing of cattle....At last his attention was drawn by seeing some one walking among the trees in his papa's garden: it was his papa himself who had been walking in the coppice, and was now returned. Mr. Fairchild went into the house, and soon returned again with Mrs. Fairchild, and Lucy and Emily, all prepared for walking. Henry watched to see which way they would go: they turned towards the coppice, and he lost sight of them. Henry began again to think,

> and he tried to consider what he first remembered of himself, and of his papa and mamma and sisters. The first thing he remembered of his mamma, was being fed by her with bread and milk, and afterwards being laid in a little bed by her, and kissed; and the first thing he remembered of his papa, was riding upon his foot, in turns with Emily and Lucy: he remembered also his mamma singing him to sleep with a hymn, and his papa reading him a little prayer, all of which seemed to him very long ago. "And have I offended them by my wicked obstinacy! Oh! I will go and kneel before my papa, and beg him to forgive me.--And yet I dare not go! He is so very angry, and I have been so very wicked!"[46]

Encouraged and supported by a new little friend, Charles Trueman, "one of the most pious little boys in all that country," Henry finally managed to face his father's wrath and beg for forgiveness. As Mrs. Sherwood wrote:

> It was no hard matter to get Mr. Fairchild to forgive Henry, now that he saw he was humble. "I freely forgive you my dear boy," said Mr. Fairchild; "and I hope, that what you have suffered these two days will be a warning to you never to rebel against your father." "Oh! Papa, Papa!" said Henry, "I have been very unhappy!" So Henry kissed his papa and mamma, and dear sisters, and they were all happy again.[48]

Mr. Fairchild was one of the best examples in the literature of the paternalistic parental type. He was a figure of authority, likening himself to God. He appeared to the child as all-powerful, all-knowing, awesome, remote, yet clearly capable of giving love and support when his conditions were met. It is significant that although Henry was afraid of his father, he also had some very tender memories of his papa as a warm, loving, kind and gentle man, a man who would play with his small son and let the child ride on his foot. Awesome and remote, strict and authoritarian, the ideal paterfamilias had to be, yet he also had to combine these characteristics with tenderness, kindness, and lovingness. This point was emphasized with respect to the marital relationship as well, and the rationale seems clear. A capacity for tenderness was the key to the husband's and father's control. His authority and position was infinitely strengthened if he could control through the basic human need for love and support. The paterfamilias could bind his dependents more closely to him through their need for love and support. Sullen rebellion would occur less frequently and with less protraction and severity if the authority figure could show that he was capable of giving love and support as well as discipline and stern judgements. He had to be able to give love and support and use them to engender love and respect for himself. An authority figure who has the love of his dependents as well as power over them is ultimately stronger and more influential than the one who has the power alone.

As stated above, paternalistic and maternalistic parental types shared a number of similarities. Both were strict disciplinarians, yet both were capable of showing great affection and kindness toward their children. In the literature at least, homes dominated by these parental types tended to be happy well-ordered homes, as examples from Susannah and Ashford Rectory indicate.

The maternalistic and paternalistic parental types differed from one another primarily in the technique of control or means of persuasion used to supplement conditional love and support. The paternalistic parent controlled through the active exercise of authority. Physical as well as verbal force could be and was employed. The maternalistic parent on the other hand, used a more passive approach, controlling through the inspiration of guilt. The misbehaving child was made to feel guilty for his thoughtless, sinful, or ungrateful behavior. The child was made to feel that through his frivolous actions, he had wounded his parent directly and deeply. Since few children genuinely wanted to hurt a beloved parent, this method was a highly successful means of correcting undesirable behavior. A perfect, if exaggerated, example of the maternalistic parent can be found in Christina, the mother of Ernest Pontifex, the hero of Samuel Butler's semi-autobiographical novel, The Way of All Flesh.[49] Butler's purpose, however, was to entertain his readers as much as to criticize the kind of parent Christina represented. The authors of didactic children's literature had a different purpose in mind. The mothers in didactic children's literature were meant to be taken seriously, to have a sobering effect on a recalcitrant child, as it had on little Charlotte in Mamma's Stories (1814):

> /Charlotte/ sat down to cry, quite in despair. While she was crying, the thought came into her head, how naughty she had been to leave her dear mamma's house, and to slap the old woman; and to tell so many falsehoods besides. And then another thought came, which was, that she had been very silly as well as naughty; for she had lost her home, and lost her dinner, and lost the umbrella, and cut her finger, and had been discovered to be a child at last, through her own foolish passion. While she was grieving about these things, a gate opened in the garden palings, and she saw her own dear mamma come out, looking very sorry and crying sadly. Now she had never seen her mamma

> cry before, and it made her feel her naughtiness the more, because she knew her mamma must be crying about her. So she ran up to her and said: "Here I am, mamma. Don't cry, mamma, for I will never be naughty and run away any more."[50]

A mother's sorrow seldom failed to have its effect. A thoughtless little girl in Eliza White's book, Gertrude felt a double burden of guilt when she realized that through her carelessness and lack of industry she had not only disappointed a little charity girl who had been expecting a new frock, she had also hurt her mother:

> Mrs. Woodford, during her walk home, expressed her sorrow and displeasure at the thoughtlessness displayed by Gertrude towards this poor child--Gertrude was silent; but her fast falling tears bore testimony to her contrition. "Indeed, my little girl," said Mrs. Woodford, "I am more hurt than you can imagine."[51]

The more passive maternalistic parent was as capable as the paternalistic parent of acting with firmness and decision, withdrawing all love and support from the offending child. To return to the story of little Charlotte:

> Her mamma led her into the garden, for it was her own garden that she had stopt at, and she took her into the house without speaking a word. When Charlotte was in the nursery, her mamma had her undressed and put to bed. Then she came into the room and said: "Charlotte, I think I am more grieved to find that you have been such a naughty and silly child than I should have been, even if we had lost you entirely, for now I have lost all my confidence in you. I cannot depend on your good behavior, nor on your affection; and I cannot have the pleasure of loving you as dearly as I did before." Then she went out of the room, and locked the door, that the little girl might not run away again. But Charlotte did not wish to run away any more; she only wished she had never been naughty, and wished her dear mamma could forgive her. She lay awake half an hour crying with sorrow, and another half hour crying with hunger, and at last she fell asleep.[52]

Similarly, in A Mother's Care Rewarded by Mary Hughes (1824), a mother dealt firmly with her vain and impatient daughter.

She decided to leave Caroline behind rather than take her on a visit to Cornwall:

> "You do not forgive me, and I shall never be happy again! I have displeased the kindest mother that ever child had. I cannot live if you send me away; I know I cannot. I shall break my heart," continued /Caroline/ sobbing aloud. "Your impatient temper is shewing itself again, Caroline," said Mrs. Roberts. "Check it, I beseach you, or I shall indeed find it hard to love you as I have done"...."I perceive mamma," said Caroline, "That you had made up your mind to part with me even before you knew how idle and naughty I had been." "You are wrong and unkind to say so; you cannot suppose your idleness escaped me. On my return home every day I always went to your desk and books, and in my sorrow perceived nothing had been done. You remember I gently hinted, that I thought you neglected your lessons."[53]

In these passages, firmness no less than gentleness and kindness are emphasized as essential characteristics of the maternalistic parent. From the child's point of view, the mother was as much a figure of authority as the father. Her power over the child was not different; it came from the same source. As Mrs. Sherwood told her young readers in Susannah, a mother received her authority over her child from God.[54]

Unfortunately, in a number of cases, due to the death or absence of the parents, insufficient information in the stories, or general inapplicability, it was not possible to categorize the parental types. For 50 fathers and 39 mothers no categories could be assigned.

In the majority of cases, no parental type could be determined for relatives, either grandparents, uncles, aunts, or cousins. This fact is not really surprising considering the small number of relatives that were actually counted part of the household and the corresponding slight influence most relatives would have had on household affairs generally. No relatives were considered hostile/punitive. One relative was considered indifferent, 12 paternalistic/maternalistic, and 10 supportive/helping. As in the case of marital relationships, parental types appeared to be unaffected by such considerations as social class, occupation, and urban or rural living conditions.

2. Parent-Child Relationships

Parent-child relationships as they were presented in the literature appeared to be of two basic types: controlling and permissive. There was a close relationship between the parental type and the type of parent-child relationship portrayed. For example, the kind of relationship a paternalistic/maternalistic parent shared with his or her child was considered a controlling relationship. This is not surprising since an essential characteristic of the paternalistic/maternalistic parent is his or her desire to control others, to make others submit to his or her will. Similarly, supportive/helping parents shared a permissive relationship with their children. They placed fewer restrictions on their children's activities, allowing the children more freedom to say and do as they pleased. A permissive relationship sometimes proved to be a positive one, as in The Dairyman's Daughter by Legh Richmond. It will be recalled that in this story, a pious young woman assumed the role of guide and teacher to her parents. In other families, this kind of relationship was portrayed very negatively. In one of the three families presented in Mrs. Sherwood's book, Susannah, a permissive relationship between a father and his children produced chaos in the household and unruly, self-indulgent children. Hostile/punitive parents shared controlling relationships with their children. In Amendment, Mr. Grant, a self-indulgent, dissipated man alternately encouraged and repelled his son and daughter. He indulged them or ignored them according to his will. In his relationship with his children he was considered controlling because he wanted to control their behavior and their affections. In Susannah, the second guardian, a hostile/punitive parent, was also considered to have a controlling relationship with her children. She too ignored or indulged her children according to her whim, and punished readily. She was less successful than Mr. Grant, however, in obtaining obedience from her children. No doubt this was in part due to the fact that her spouse was permissive in his relationship with the children, where Mrs. Grant was controlling.

The two types of parent-child relationships were analyzed further. With respect to the controlling relationship, a distinction was made between the controlling parent who was jealous or possessive and the controlling parent who was detached and rational. The possessive parent's response to his or her child was based on emotion whereas the detached parent's response was based on reason. In the latter case there appeared to be some distance, deliberately established by the parent between himself or herself and the child. In some instances, the distance bordered on indifference. The difference between the two types of relationships is well illustrated in the characters of two fathers already discussed in this chapter, Mr. Grant in Amendment and Mr. Fairchild in The History of the Fairchild Family. Mr. Grant's relationship with his children was jealous and possessive. He competed with his wife for control of their two children. He was particularly interested in winning over his son. Mr. Fairchild, on the other hand, never exhibited jealousy or possessiveness, nor did he compete with his wife for the control or affection of his children. His behavior when little Henry refused to learn his Latin exhibited aloofness, distance, and determination to control. His decision to put little Henry outside the bosom of his family was made calmly, rationally, without passion. Mr. Fairchild always appeared to be in total control of himself. His children were obedient and deferent, dutiful and affectionate or they were dismissed from his presence and from his thoughts.

Another example of a controlling/detached relationship was Mr. Dalben's relationship with his nephew and foster son in The History of Henry Milner by Mrs. Sherwood. In the following passage, Mr. Dalben reacted calmly, rationally, and with great determination in the face of childish insurrection:

> [Henry] often showed a great deal of ill temper when Mr. Dalben called him to read. He would not, for many days, say the letter F. His uncle bought him a set of ivory letters, and used to lay them on the

> floor at the farthest end of the room, and direct him to bring each letter as he called for it; but if Mr. Dalben chanced to call for F, he would bring every letter in the alphabet first, and leave that to the very last; and one day he was so naughty about it, that he would not bring it at all, till his uncle got up to see if it was there, and actually found it lying on the carpet. "There it is, Henry," he said; "pick it up, and carry it to the rest." But the little boy swelled out his cheeks, and would not obey. When Mr. Dalben saw this, he remembered Solomon's words, "correct thy son while there is hope: Thou shalt beat him with a rod and save his soul from hell." Accordingly, the old gentleman called for a twig out of Sally's besom, and laying little master over his knee, he made him recollect the letter F another time. Henry cried violently; but the moment he was set down he took up the ivory letter, carried it to the appointed place, and came back in a moment to kiss his uncle and beg pardon. "You will thank me for this by and by, my little man," said Mr. Dalben, wiping the tears from Henry's face; "and I will tell you, moreover, my boy, I love you too well to omit any means appointed by God for your soul's good."[55]

Gradually and firmly, Mr. Dalben brought little Henry completely under his control.

Calm, detached behavior on the part of the parent also marked the relationship between father and daughter in Right and Wrong by Maria Budden (1815). In the following incident, Rosa had just learned that a ball she had been anticipating had been cancelled. She burst into tears, whereupon her father said:

> "Come, my dear Rosa, exert your good sense; bear well an evil you cannot remedy"--Rosa burst into a fresh agony of tears and would not be comforted--"So far I have pitied you Rosa," continued her father, "force me not by your prolonged sorrow, to despise you"--Rosa looked up angrily--"Very true, Rosa, unreasonable sorrow can only be despised. You do not chuse to be despised, I see you do not. Well then, act like a reasonable creature."[56]

One final example of a controlling/detached relationship can be taken from Mrs. Cameron's book, The Two Mothers. In this incident, Mary-Anne's aunt, a more forceful character than the little girl's own mother, has taken charge in order to demonstrate the right way of dealing with a troublesome child:

> When Mary-Anne discovered that her aunt was resolute, I am sorry to say that she commenced such a struggle, that it was not without some effort that her aunt conveyed her from the room into her own bed-chamber, where the child threw herself on the floor, kicking and striking everything that was near her. Mrs. Grove calmly tied her hands behind her with a silk handkerchief, and carried her into a large closet: and as she closed the door upon her, she said to her, "Mary-Anne, I saw lately, in a show, a young tiger, and his keeper was obliged to put a chain round his neck and fasten him up in a small den, or else he would have torn everybody to pieces that came near him; and if you choose to behave like a tiger, you must be treated like one. When you become like a tame lamb again, I will let you out of this closet."
> Mrs. Grove sat down near the door of the closet calmly waiting the issue of the contest, and praying for the divine blessing upon the means she was using. In about a quarter of an hour, there was silence in the closet, but another quarter of an hour succeeded before any overtures of peace were made. At last, a small, calm voice called out, "Aunty, the tiger is gone."[57]

As a rule, in controlling/detached relationships, parents and those acting in the place of parents, were presented in a favorable light. Judging from the number of controlling/detached relationships, it was clearly the preferred type. There were 45 such father-son relationships, 45 father-daughter, 34 mother-son, and 43 mother-daughter controlling/detached relationships.

Parents who were jealous and possessive in their relationship with their children appeared far less frequently in the literature and were portrayed in an unfavorable light. As already noted, Mr. Grant in Amendment was such a character.

Mothers were a little more inclined to be jealous and possessive in their relationships with their children than were fathers. One of the best examples of this kind of mother was the orphan Susannah's second guardian or foster mother in Mrs. Sherwood's book, Susannah. Once again, the parent in this relationship did not appear in a favorable light. She was a petulant and childish woman, careless, indolent, and self-indulgent. She demanded consideration and affection from her children but did nothing to encourage these things. Her household affairs were chaotic, her person and her home unkempt, her children disobedient and unruly. In Maria Budden's book, Claudine, the mother was a weak, helpless person, unable to deal with the series of crises that affected her family. Her daughter Claudine, a girl of great physical and spiritual strength, was able to ease her mother's distress, deal with her mother's fears and complaints, and keep the family together. Once again the parent appeared as a weak but demanding individual. In two further instances, the mothers involved were stepmothers, and unkind ones at that. In Mrs. Cameron's book, The Willoughby Family (1824), and in Emily, A Tale for Young Persons (1825), two young girls had to endure numerous slights and deprivations from women who were jealous and protective of the rights of their own children against girls they viewed as intruders.

The low incidence of jealous and possessive relationships and the unfavorable presentation of the characters involved, clearly indicates that it was not a desirable type.

Two father-son and 2 father-daughter relationships were considered jealous and possessive; 4 mother-son and 4 mother-daughter relationships were considered jealous and possessive.

It must be emphasized that in controlling relationships, whether they were rational and detached in nature, or jealous and possessive, the parents' overriding concern was to control the child, to combat the will of the child, using whatever means might be necessary. Physical, verbal and/or psychological methods of coercion could be used. Love and support were given to the child conditionally.

Permissive relationships appeared far less frequently in the literature than controlling relationships. Like controlling relationships, permissive relationships could be broken down into two types: permissive/indulgent and permissive/rational. In permissive/indulgent relationships, parents were careless and seemed to be controlled by their children rather than the other way around. The children were undisciplined, self-indulgent, and lazy; household affairs in general were chaotic. Examples of this kind of relationship were found in The Two Edwards by Mary Elliot and Anna Ross by Grace Kennedy (1824). The father of the second family presented in Susannah was also indulgent.

Not all permissive/indulgent families were portrayed unfavorably, however. For example, in Legh Richmond's book, The Dairyman's Daughter, both husband and wife were pious, industrious individuals, devoted to their children. Their children were worthy of their devotion. As noted above, one daughter in particular became her parents' and her sister's mentor. Her parents praised her piety, and encouraged her in her efforts to minister to others. In another story, The Blind Brother and Sister by Catherine Parr Traill (1830), the father was not criticized for his indulgent treatment of his daughter. Indeed, he was to be pitied, because his love and devotion for his daughter contrasted sharply with her selfishness and carelessness. Although he was a semi-invalid, she neglected him. She eventually learned the virtues of duty, charity, selflessness, and kindness from a little peasant girl and her blind brother. The selfish girl became a submissive, devoted daughter. Similarly, in Soffrona and Her Cat Muff by Mrs. Sherwood, Soffrona's foster mother appeared in a benign light even though she indulged the little girl and overlooked many of her transgressions. Mrs. Sherwood did not really criticize the woman when she wrote:

> When she /Soffrona/ had done all she could for Muff /the kitten/, she should have given her mind to her other duties; but she could not command herself to attend to anything else all that morning, and learned her lessons so ill, that, if the lady had not been very indulgent, she would have deprived her of the pleasure of walking with Sophia to see the old woman and to carry the petticoat.[58]

As these examples indicate, in permissive/indulgent relationships, parents were not particularly interested in controlling their children. They were more interested in allowing and/or helping their children achieve what the latter desired. As Catherine Parr Traill's story indicated, they were willing to give their children unconditional love and support. Parent-child relationships of this kind tended to be closer than those that were considered controlling. Permissive/indulgent parents were less aloof and they were not interested in establishing or maintaining distance between themselves and their children. Eight father-son, 8 father-daughter, 8 mother-son, and 9 mother-daughter relationships were perceived to be of the permissive/indulgent type.

Permissive/rational relationships were similar to permissive/indulgent relationships in that closeness rather than distance was emphasized and love and support were given unconditionally. Here too, the parent was less interested in controlling the child than in helping the child reach desired goals. However, there was less tendency on the part of parents to indulge their children in this type of relationship. Parents made careful, rational decisions on behalf of their children--decisions based on what they perceived to be the children's best interests. Mr. Hervey in Edgar White Benson's book, Education at Home, appeared to have this type of relationship with his children. He devoted himself to his son's education believing that "in watching over the education of his children, he was contributing in a greater degree to their happiness, than by accumulating wealth and leaving their minds to be trained by dependents." As the author wrote:

> In dedicating much of his time to their instruction, Mr. Hervy felt himself amply repaid by their increased attachment. To their father they always applied in all their sorrows for advice and consolation; and in all their pleasures his sympathetic smile was looked for.[59]

Closeness, warmth, and a certain objectivity on the part of the mother characterized the relationship between a mother and her two daughters in Mary and Florence by Ann Tytler.[60] The following exchange between Florence and her mother indicates something of the nature of their relationship. Just before the conversation took place, the two little girls had inadvertently killed a baby chicken and were filled with remorse:

> "Oh, Mamma," /Florence/ said, "I am very, very, sorry! But I see now I cannot be good. And what am I to do about that? For it is of no use to go to sleep on a good resolution. I will not make any good resolutions, never again in my whole life." "Florence," said Mrs. Percy, mildly, "you are doing wrong again now, to say so. It is not in making a good resolution that you have erred; but in making it in your own strength. You have forgotten, that I told you, that of yourself you can do nothing. You may, and ought to make good resolutions; but you must, at the same time, ask God for the assistance of his Holy Spirit, to enable you to keep them."[61]

Children in this type of relationship, often appeared resourceful and industrious, as in The History of Farmer Darwin and His Family by A. Selwyn, Sophia by Mrs. Cameron, and The Little Cowslip Gatherers by Esther Copley. These children were serious, obedient, and dutiful, and displayed considerable initiative in adding to the family's resources if the family was needy. Mutual respect between parents and children seemed to be a characteristic of this type of relationship.

Even though parents and children in permissive/rational relationships were portrayed in a favorable light, this type of relationship was not common in the literature. Five father-son relationships were considered to be permissive/ rational; 5 father-daughter, 7 mother-son, and 10 mother-daughter relationships were considered permissive/rational.

A number of parent-child relationships did not fall comfortably into the categories. In The History of Little Henry and His Bearer by Mrs. Sherwood (1814; 1815), The Good Grandmother and Her Offspring by Barbara Hofland, and The Good Aunt by Harriet Ventum, parent-child relationships were characterized by indifference. In Mrs. Sherwood's book, The Little Woodman and His Dog Caesar, indifference alternated with hostility in the father's relationship with all his sons except his youngest. The youngest son, William, was a great comfort and source of support to his father. In The Family Mansion by Ann Taylor, the mother, indolent and frivolous, had no interest in controlling or instructing her daughter. Although she allowed her daughter to be raised by servants, a circumstance that later caused much harm, she was not totally indifferent to her daughter, nor was she cruel. She indulged her daughter's fancies, often participating in them herself, and frequently took her daughter's side against her husband and her wiser mother-in-law. Her relationship with her daughter was best described as simply indulgent. Lucy Newton (1830) presented a unique situation in which a little peasant girl was adopted by two spinster ladies. The attitudes of these ladies towards children and child-rearing differed enormously. The relationship between one woman and the child was described as controlling/possessive, the other as permissive/rational. The book, interestingly enough, was subtitled, "An Experiment in Education"; needless to say, the experiment was less than successful.

It was not possible to determine the nature of parent-child relationships in 230 situations, an unfortunately large number indeed. This was due to the death or absence of one or both parents or simply insufficient information in the story itself.

3. Adult-Child Relationships

Adult-child relationships were considered in the same categories as parent-child relationships. For the majority of cases, because so few aunts, uncles, and grandparents were actually closely involved with the immediate family or the household, too little information was available to allow any reasonable sort of categorization. Of those relationships that could be categorized, none were considered controlling/possessive, 17 were considered controlling/detached, 7 permissive/indulgent and 5 permissive/rational. In Susannah the relationship between one of the aunts and Susannah was considered both indifferent and indulgent; the aunt alternately ignored her niece and overindulged her. In The Factory Girl (1831) the relationship between the aunt and her niece, Mary, was considered hostile. Mary's relationship with her grandmother, however, was considered permissive/indulgent. The girl secured a job in a cotton factory in order to support the aged woman.

4. Discipline

i. The Dispensation of Rewards and Punishments

In the majority of families, both parents participated equally in the dispensation of rewards and punishments. Where they did not, there was usually a good reason: the absence, illness, or death of one or both parents. Mrs. Benson in Fabulous Histories, for example, dispensed rewards and punishments, but her husband was absent on business throughout the story, and she was left to "govern in his absence." The reader might assume, however, from indications of her character provided in the story, that under normal conditions, the task would be shared equally with her husband. But since he never actually appeared in the story, she must be considered the primary dispenser of rewards and punishments in the Benson family. Similarly, in The Visit by Miss Grierson, the mother must be considered the source of all rewards and punishments because her husband too was absent in the story. In The First Theft by Mrs. Marshall, the father was considered the primary dispenser of rewards and punishments because his wife was ill, an invalid confined to her bed. In 53 families both parents shared equally in the dispensation of rewards and punishments. In 19 families the mother had the primary responsibility, and in another 19 families the father had that responsibility. In 28 families the responsibility could not be determined because of insufficient information in the story or inapplicability. In a small number of cases, the couple was childless or the family consisted of only a bachelor or a spinster. In a number of cases as well, there was no occasion in the story for the dispensation of rewards or punishments. The children were naturally well-behaved, and did not seem to require particular attention from their parents or guardians, as in The History of Little Lucy (1819), Ellen by Alicia Mant (1815), and The History of Little Henry and His Bearer by Mrs. Sherwood. Generally speaking then, husband and wife in the ideal family were expected to share equally in the responsibility of disciplining their children, to support one another in disciplinary matters, and to present a solid front in the face of their children. Mrs. Fairchild, for example, supported her husband in word and deed in all matters of discipline. When Mr. Fairchild announced that he intended to take his children to Blackwood to view the fatal results of strife among bothers and sisters, she replied that although she could not accompany them there, "I approve of your taking the children."[62] When the children misbehaved or quarrelled with one another, they had to face the awful grave looks of both parents. And when Mr. Fairchild whipped Henry and cast him aside for refusing to learn his Latin, Mrs. Fairchild supported him fully. She could be as firm as her husband in matters of discipline.[63] The children received gifts from time to time from both parents, and when any one of the children showed sincere repentance for a childish misdemeanor, neither parent hesitated to show pleasure or to kneel in prayer with the child.

There was a tendency overall for the mother to be more involved with the discipline of her daughters, and the father with his sons. To use the Fairchild family again as an example, it was Mr. Fairchild who usually dealt first with little Henry when he misbehaved, as Mrs. Fairchild dealt with Lucy and Emily. Mrs. Fairchild gave Lucy a diary to act as her conscience following an episode of misbehavior, and when Emily wickedly took damascenes from the pantry, it was her mother who heard her confessions and treated her accordingly. Yet there were occasions when one or both parents were directly involved in the discipline of all three children regardless of sex. In the Blackwood incident, Mr. Fairchild took charge of Emily and Lucy as well as Henry. When the three children misbehaved while their parents were away, Mrs. Fairchild was the one who received their apologies and admonished them.

There was also a tendency for the father rather than the mother to administer physical punishment when it was necessary. Mrs. Fairchild never struck her children although she did not hesitate to use other forms of punishment. Nor did Mrs. Grove strike her children in The Two Mothers by Mrs. Cameron. However, she did not hesitate to tie up a child and lock her in a closet when she felt it was required.

ii. Methods of Discipline

Although few historians of the family and childhood have gone quite as far as Lloyd deMause in their condemnation of methods of parenting in the past and stated quite as forcefully that "the history of childhood is a nightmare from which we have only recently begun to awaken,"[64] the general consensus among historians seems to be that childhood was much less pleasant in the past than it is today, and that children in the past were subject to harsher, more rigorous discipline. As an example of this general historical opinion, one may quote Lawrence Stone in his section on "post-1800 developments":

> Dedicated reforming Evangelists slowly but surely triumphed over the easy-going permissiveness of the eighteenth century, and as a result punishment became once again both frequent and severe. It was now less the old-fashioned flogging, except at school, but rather newer, more devastating methods of withdrawal of affection, coupled with food and sensory deprivation. It was normal to lock a child for hours or even days in a dark room or closet on a limited diet of bread and water. Further to break the child's will, it was constantly emphasized that "every fault of our children /is/ to be felt by them as an offence against God.... The general picture is one of a severe family discipline, flourishing in Scotland and London, over thirty years before Queen Victoria came to the throne, at a time when other upper class families were still clinging to the permissive and affectionate late eighteenth century ones: crushing the will and assisting learning with blows. The only difference was that beating was reserved for academic lapses, and that starvation and locking in closets were used instead to break the will. The tide had clearly turned by 1818 with the publication of The History of the Fairchild Family by Mrs. Sherwood which was an immediate and lasting best-seller as a book for children. The moral of the book is that children are by nature depraved creatures, that every slip is a grievous sin against God and that the appropriate punishment is confinement in a dark closet. As substitutes for Cinderella, Jack the Giant Killer or Mother Goose, Mrs. Sherwood's books ushered in a new era in middle and upper class child reading.[65]

Certainly concepts of discipline in the past were much more severe than they are today as numerous passing references in the literature have indicated. Incidents of children being tied up and locked in closets were common in the literature, and it is known from letters, journals, and autobiographies of contemporary men and women that such things did happen, and that the literature did indeed reflect common methods of discipline.

Methods of discipline used by parents in the literature were divided into two broad categories: physical and non-physical. Physical discipline could mean actual corporal punishment that is, striking or beating, as well as isolation and deprivation. An example of isolation would be locking a child in a closet, as Mrs. Grove locked Mary-Anne in the closet in The Two Mothers by Mrs. Cameron. Deprivation would consist of deprivation of food, toys, and pleasures. Nonphysical discipline could be verbal, such as admonition or scolding; psychological, involving the inspiration of fear or guilt in the child, or it could mean the withdrawal of love and support. An example of psychological discipline used by a parent would be the visit to Blackwood conducted by Mr. Fairchild. The casting out of little Henry for his refusal to learn Latin would not only be an example of withdrawal of support, but also of isolation and deprivation since he was isolated from his family, prevented from joining any family recreation, and given only bread and water for his supper. The example of Henry's punishment demonstrates that methods of discipline could be combined.

The method of discipline least favored in the literature was corporal punishment. This may appear surprising at first, particularly if one holds the view that the nineteenth century was for children an age of harsh, rigorous discipline. Yet the literature supports Stone's argument that although punishment became frequent and severe after 1800, in contrast to the earlier, "permissive age," "it was now less the old-fashioned flogging except at school, but rather newer, more devastating methods of withdrawal of affection coupled with food and sensory deprivation." Indeed, corporal punishment was used on children in only three of the one hundred books examined. One of these books was The History of the Fairchild Family. In this book, the female sex was not spared. Lucy and Emily were whipped as well as their brother Henry. Corporal punishment also occurred in another of Mrs. Sherwood's books, The History of Henry Milner. Like little Henry Fairchild, Henry Milner was beaten for obstinacy and disobedience and refusal to learn his lessons. Corporal punishment was also used in Dorothy Kilner's book, The Holiday Present (1780; 1831).

A more common method of physical discipline was isolation. In 26 books and stories, isolation was one of the methods used. As already noted, Henry Fairchild in History of the Fairchild Family and Mary-Anne in The Two Mothers were shut in closets to correct obstinate behavior. It was not uncommon to take isolation even farther and expel the child completely from the family. Boys in particular who could not be controlled were sometimes sent away to school as in The Advantages of Education Elucidated, in the History of the Wingfield Family (1819), Education at Home by Edgar White Benson, and The History of Little Frank and His Sister by Mrs. Cameron (1837). "To be sent away to school" was indeed used as a threat by parents in the literature. Girls could be sent away to school if they could not be controlled at home, as Mrs. Cameron demonstrated in The Fruits of Education, but it occurred much less frequently. An alternative method was to put a recalcitrant child under the care of a relative or guardian who might employ sterner methods, as in The Two Mothers by Mrs. Cameron, and A Mother's Care Rewarded by Mary Hughes. In the latter story, the mother told Caroline, her vain, impatient, and stubborn daughter:

> I fear you want a more strict preceptress than your mother can ever be: unremitting attention is what you must have, but which, in the present state of my affairs, I cannot pay you...It is the superintendence of one accustomed to the education of youth that you require--one who gives her whole time to her pupils, and who, while she gently and kindly leads you to do what is right, will both reprimand and punish you when you do wrong."[66]

In The Little Prisoner by Catherine Parr Traill and Susanna Moodie, a father had an original method of isolating a passionate, unruly, bad-tempered child. He had his son committed to a prison and fed on bread and water.

Deprivation was not as popular a method of discipline as isolation. It occurred in only 14 books and stories. Deprivation was usually combined with another method of discipline, such as isolation as in The Little Prisoner and Dorothy Kilner's book, The Holiday Present. In the latter book, Mr. Jennet, the father, combined deprivation with isolation and punishment that was clearly physical, although not corporal, in his treatment of his son. Mr. Jennet tied up the naughty boy, thus separating him from his brothers and preventing him from joining their games. As the author wrote:

> [*Mr. Jennet*] asked *Charles* how he came to *be* so naughty [as to help himself to his brother's apple]? But *Charles* instead of acknowledging his fault and being sorry for it, only said, he did it because he wanted an apple, and should do so another time, unless he had one of his own. "Why then," said Mr. *Jennet*, "I think it very necessary you should be prevented from doing so again; I shall, therefore, tie your hands behind you, and your legs together, as you tied *Thomas's*." *Charles* then began to cry, and begged his papa not to punish him; but Mr. *Jennet* told him, that as he thought he deserved the punishment, he certainly would inflict it, though he was very sorry to be obliged to do it. Accordingly, he tied his hands behind him and his legs together, so that he could not walk, and made him continue in that uncomfortable way all day; while *George* and *Thomas* were enjoying their liberty, and running about.[67]

Mr. Jennet also told his son that "if you do not behave better tomorrow than you have done today, I shall lock you up in my study, and not suffer you to play all day."[68]

Deprivation consisted most often of deprivation of food or pleasures. In *Mamma's Stories*, a little girl was deprived of both her parents' attention in her recreation and a companion when she behaved in a rude and selfish manner to a little playmate. When she was scolded by her mother for her behavior, the following exchange took place:

> "But mamma," said Fanny, "when I play with you you always let me do my own way; and when I play with papa, he does whatever I bid him, and makes believe to be my little boy; and *all* the dolls are my own too; and when I play with the dolls alone they never move, nor take anything from me, but stay in their houses while I visit them all round."
> "This is because your papa and I have no interest in your childish plays," said Mrs. Beverley; "and we only give up our employments to gratify you, by being your companions; and the dolls, you know, are not alive, and can neither think or feel in reality, though you are amused by making believe they do. But now, Fanny

> as you have behaved so ill, you will have nothing but these dolls to play with; for I shall take Jemima home to her own dear mama and her little sisters, who will indulge and comfort her after your unkindness; and neither papa or I shall play with you any more, till you are sensible of your folly, as well as of your fault in quarrelling with your little friend"....Fanny remained in great disgrace for many days. Her papa and mama were too much displeased to play with her; she found her dolls very dull, and she began to regret that she had driven away her little playfellow.[69]

This method of discipline could also be considered an example of withdrawal of support.

By far the most common methods of discipline were non-physical. Verbal discipline was used in 81 books and stories, psychological in 17 and withdrawal of support in 38 books and stories.

Verbal discipline could consist of praise, admonition, or reproach. Very often a parent's word was all that was required to bring a recalcitrant child into line. For example, when Henry preferred to read than perform an errand for his father in A Week at Christmas (1829), a few well-chosen words were all that was necessary to make the boy obey. To quote:

> Henry. But you often tell me to read, and to read books that will instruct me; and, by the example of wise and good men, improve my mind: and now that I want to read, you will not let me.
> Ralph. There is a time for all things, Henry; and if you have not learned from your books that it is your duty to obey your father, you have not profited by your reading as you ought to have done. Moreover, it is not for people who have to work for their bread to be reading all day long: They have "to learn and labour to get their own living, and to do their duty in that state of life into which it shall please God to call them."
> Henry. True father; I will obey you. I am sorry that I have been inclined to break these great commandments.[70]

Far more interesting to modern readers, at least from the point of sensationalism, are examples of psychological discipline and withdrawal of support. Some examples of psychological discipline make rather macabre, sensational reading today. These incidents were intended to shock, and it is probable that they achieved their purpose. In one such incident in The Good Aunt by Harriet Ventum (1813), Mrs. Althorpe decided to cure her niece of her passionate behavior by showing her what could happen if the passions were not controlled. Matilda was taken to visit an insane woman, a woman who had been indulged and not controlled as a child. This woman consequently could not control her passions as an adult, and one day in the midst of a rage, murdered her own child. She lost her reason and was all but abandoned by her husband. After relating the terrible details of this woman's history to her niece, the aunt said:

> Thus you see, Matilda, how the judgements and vengeance of the Almighty are manifested. Our punishments are not always deferred to a future state, but are frequently sent while on earth, to serve as a warning to ourselves, and a warning to others. Signally was the wrath of God shewn to Maria, who in giving way to her fury against a helpless being, was the means of death to her own and only child; one in whom she would willingly have forfeited her own existence. Life is to her become a curse--memory her bitterest tormentor! Happy, happy for her could she lose, in the insensibility under which she labours, the memory of the past; but even through the delerium of insanity it pursues her. Learn then, Matilda, the necessity of bridling your passions. Believe me, it is easier to subdue them in youth than in age; they gather strength from indulgence, and too often, as in the tale I have just related, are productive of the most fatal consequences; Thus you see, my dear, if you do not subdue your passions, your passions will conquer you."[71]

A father took his two sons to visit a prison in Education at Home by E. W. Benson. He wished to impress upon them, in a way they would be unlikely to forget, the consequences of idleness. As the author described the scene:

> As Mr. Hervey was well known to the keeper, he was admitted without hesitation, to whatever part of the building he desired. The boys were much shocked by the dejected and sickly appearance of many of the prisoners; and by the damp and dusky apartments in which they were confined. The gloomy aspect which the mossy stone walls, and the windows, strongly grated with iron bars, gave the building, made them shudder. They pressed closer to their father, as they gazed upon the malignant countenances of some ferocious-looking men, who were walking in the court; who just raised their eyes as the visitors passed, and then drew their slouched hats lower over their brows, as if ashamed or unwilling to be seen. At every step, the clanking of their chains resounded through the walls.[72]

Mr. Hervey showed his sons a number of cells. One in particular must have impressed the boys, for it contained "a mixed multitude of all ages: boys of nine and ten years old, apprentices and young men, along with the aged and infirm, who seemed just tottering on the brink of the grave."[73] And finally:

> In a strong vaulted apartment, sunk as far beneath the ground as to receive the light from a grating above, without fire, and from the smallness of the aperture, almost without light, were confined those who had committed felonies. On looking through the grate, they could only discern some figures moving about; and they heard mingled with the clanking of chains, singing and laughter, oaths and imprecations. "This," said Mr. Hervey, "is the last receptacle of human misery and depravity. These men preferred breaking into their neighbour's house to extort from him, by fear or pain, his hard-earned savings, before a more labourious life. Some of them will be banished from their country, their homes, and their friends; and some few of the worst will be put to death. Yet you see many of these wretches are so hardened as, in a great measure, to appear insensible of their fate. 'Idleness is the root of all evil'."[74]

In order to impress upon his children the wickedness of quarrelling, Mr. Fairchild took his three children to Blackwood to "shew them something there which, I think they will remember as long as they live: and I hope they will take warning from it, and pray more earnestly for new hearts, that they may love each other with perfect and heavenly love."[75] What Mr. Fairchild had to show then was a gibbet "on which the body of a man hung in chains":

> It had not yet fallen to pieces, although it had hung there some years. The body had a blue coat, a silk handkerchief round the neck, with shoes and stockings, and every other part of the dress still entire: but the face of the corpse was so shocking, that the children could not look at it.
> "Oh Papa, Papa! What is that?" cried the children.
> "That is a gibbet," said Mr. Fairchild; "and the man who hangs upon it is a murderer--one who first hated, and afterwards killed his brother!"[76]

This incident which so shocked the Fairchild children, undoubtedly shocked many young readers as it continues to shock readers today. It was and still is one of the best remembered incidents in the book, and probably the most quoted in surveys of children's literature.

Mr. and Mrs. Jennet in Dorothy Kilner's book, The Holiday Present developed a unique and effective method of disciplining their children. They brought before their children two large locked boxes. Charles was given the key to the first box, and he opened it "while they all stood round to see what was in it":

> But how were they surprised to find three rods, a fool's cap, and some silver medals, each tied through a hole with a yellow ribbon. On one of them was the following words: Whoever wears this is a cross child: upon another, Whoever wears this, cannot be depended upon when out of sight: upon a third, The wearer of

> *this has told a lie*: and on the fourth, *This medal is a badge of sloth and idleness*. All the Miss and Master *Jennets* were much disappointed to find the box contain such disagreeable objects; and all of them looking very grave, turned away, and walked to their seats. I find, my dears, said their papa, the sight of what the box contains is very disagreeable to you; and no doubt the rods, and such kind of things, must be far from agreeable to any body: for my part, I dislike the sight of them as much as any of you can, and shall be very glad never to be obliged to open the box any more; but it is the duty of all parents to make their children good; and if they will not be persuaded to mind without punishment, it must be inflicted. You may depend upon it, therefore, that these rods, this ridiculous fool's cap, and these medals will be taken out, and used, if any of you render it necessary; otherwise, the box shall never again be unlocked. He then locked it up, and carried it out of the room.[77]

The second box was the same sort, but much larger than the first. Naturally, the children were quite reluctant to open this box after their first disappointment. They feared the contents of the second box would be even more unpleasant, particularly since it was even larger than the first. However:

> Upon their papa's giving them the key and telling them to do it, they unlocked it, and lifting up the lid, discovered it to be filled with books, bats, balls, kites, nine-pins, marbles, work bags, housewifes, dolls, boxes, and a great variety of pretty things, which I do not now recollect. They soon changed their countenances, and each one smiled at so pleasing a prospect. Well, how do you like the contents of this box? said Mr. *Jennet*. They all replied, they liked them very well. And which, he said, should you chose to receive some of; what is now before you, or what you saw in the other box? They all again replied, that they should much prefer what they now saw, and never desired to have another sight of the other as long as they lived. Neither do I, replied their papa; and I assure your [sic] it entirely depends upon yourselves, whethe [sic] it shall ever be opened again or not. If you be good, and behave as you ought, which you all very well know how to do, *this* box (touching the one before them) is the only one that shall ever be unlocked, and, from *this*, I will reward you according to your merits; but if you be naughty, and will not mind what is said to you, I again repeat, that the other *must* be opened, and what is in it applied with great severity.[78]

The two boxes were named, appropriately, "the good child's box" and "the naughty child's box." For a whole week the children behaved extremely well and were rewarded for their behavior out of the good child's box. But as may be expected, good things seldom last, and one of the children misbehaved. The bad child was Charles, the little boy who, it will be remembered, had been tied up all day and night by his father for stealing his brother's apple, and for general rudeness, obstinacy, and insubordination. Charles, who "seldom continued good long together," received his just reward:

> *Charles* [said Mr. Jennet], you know I always keep my word, and never promise what I do not perform....I... told you if you were naughty, you should be punished, and I now must keep my word. I am sorry to be obliged to unlock the *naughty child's box*, but your behavior makes me do it. Mr. *Jennet* then took the key out of his pocket, and fetched in the medal which had the words upon it, *whoever wears this is a cross child*! and tied it with the yellow ribbon around *Charles's* neck. He cried sadly at having it put on; and to be sure that is not to be wondered at, as it looked extremely ridiculous to see a yellow ribbon round a boy's neck, and a bow, and long ends hanging upon his coat down his back, and a medal bobbing about under his chin with such disgraceful words upon it: but, as he had been so cross to his sister, it was proper he should be punished.[79]

Charles was made to wear the medal all day. The author emphasized his extreme misery:

> *Charles* was quite ashamed of walking about, for every body who saw him took hold of the medal and read the inscription upon it. Some people said, There's a *cross boy*! Do not go near him! Others said, that boy deserves to be whipped! So that he found he was laughed at, and despised by everyone who saw him, and most heartily sorry was he that he had behaved so.
> In the afternoon, some gentlemen and ladies drank tea with Mr. and Mrs. *Jennet*; and *Charles* felt so exceedingly ashamed when he came into the room, that he did not know which way to look. As soon as he made his

> appearance, not knowing at first what it was, they all inquired why he chose to wear so much yellow ribbon around his neck? But when they were close enough to read the words upon the medal, they begged he would not come near any of them, as they all greatly disliked cross people. Charles was so mortified at the disgrace, that he could not help crying all the time he was in the room; and very early desired leave to go to bed; and upon his promising not to behave so any more, and acknowledging he was sorry for his fault, his papa took off the medal, and permitted him to retire.[80]

Charles's humiliation was not complete, however, for on Saturday, when the good child's box was opened, all the children received toys except Charles. He did not go quite unrewarded for what good behavior he had shown during the week, however. He received an orange.

Little Charlotte, Charles's sister was made to wear the fool's cap for her misbehavior, a punishment every bit as humiliating as that experienced by her brother:

> The cap was made something in the shape of a sugar loaf; and had two long ears, like asses ears, sticking up from the sides; it was painted red, blue, green, yellow, scarlet, and black; with bits of coloured ribbons streaming from it, and in the middle of the front, was the picture of a naughty child crying; so that, you may think, it looked extremely ugly and ridiculous. Miss Charlotte screamed so loud when it was put on, that her mamma threatened to tie up her mouth....When dinner was ready, Mr. Jennet was quite shocked to see his daughter with so frightful a cap on her head; nor could her brothers and sister, or the servants, keep from looking at it, to see how strange and ridiculous it looked.[81]

Charlotte required further discipline. She was made to put on a medal for lying and was whipped for her wickedness. When at last the girl was sent to bed:

> The thoughts of her crime was /sic/ so much in her head, that she could sleep but very little all night; and the disgrace she was under, made her mind exceedingly uneasy indeed, so that she only laid and cried, and sincerely repented that she had been so very naughty.[82]

Mr. and Mrs. Jennet's method of discipline achieved success with all their children except the infamous Charles. All the Jennet children, save Charles, grew up to be "worthy men and women, comfortable to themselves, and beloved and admired by everybody who knew them."[83] The author of The Holiday Present hoped that "the little child who is now reading this pretty book," will "learn to imitate the good Miss and Master Jennets," remember the sad fate of Charles, "and always take pains to be good." For indeed Charles, unlike his brothers and sister, "from the badness of his disposition, and cross, disobliging temper was despised, and shunned by all mankind":

> Nobody liked to be in company with him, and even his brothers and sisters went but seldom to see him; though they would have gone with all their hearts, if he would but have been kind and civil to them; but instead of being so, he was so quarrelsome, that they never knew how to please him, or not to give offence. In short, he was a most miserable unhappy man, and passed all his time extremely uncomfortably, without being loved by any one person in the world. He lived by himself, for no one chose to live with him; nor could he ever get servants to stay with him above a month at a time; neither did any of his neighbours visit him, because they did not chuse to keep company with so bad a tempered person. His sad behavior gave the greatest uneasiness to his parents and they would certainly have died of grief, had they not been comforted by the very different conduct of his brothers and sister; who by their kind and dutiful behavior, gave them great satisfaction and joy; and, by their constant attention to everything their father and mother liked, repaid the pains and care they had taken of their education. It is much to be wished that all children, who read this history, will learn to imitate the good Miss and Master Jennets, and if ever they have been naughty before, it is to be hoped, that, like Miss Charlotte, they will repent, and be sorry for their crimes, and take care never to be guilty of the same again; lest they should at last come to be as unhappy and miserable as Master Charles! which, they may depend upon it, they will be if, like him, they neglect to mind what is said to them.[84]

Another example of psychological discipline worthy of note occurred in Mamma's Stories, a collection of stories about four little girls. In "Mary," a vain little girl thought she would improve her appearance by painting her cheeks red so as to imitate a lady she admired who was known to use rouge. The occasion was an eagerly anticipated outing to visit some ladies for tea. Just before Mary and her mamma were to leave, Mary

> went into her playroom, and took the doll's looking glass out of the baby house, and wetted her painting brushes, and put some red paint on her cheeks, in the same way that she used to paint her pictures; then she held up her doll's mirror, and thought she looked very pretty; and then she put some more paint on, till at last her cheeks were as red as two little bricks. Now she wanted her poke bonnet, to hide this piece of vanity from her mamma, for fear she should be obliged to have her rouge washed off; and when they were going to Mrs. Beresford's, she turned away from her mamma, and pretended to be looking out of the carriage window all the way.[85]

The author added confidentially:

> I do not know whether her mamma did not perceive the paint, or whether she saw it and would not notice it, in order that Mary's conceit might prove its own punishment; but I rather think the latter was the case, because mammas are generally able to find out the tricks of their poor, little, silly children.[86]

Poor Mary did not achieve the effect she had hoped she would, for as Mrs. Beresford stooped down to kiss the little girl, she saw her painted cheeks and "started back." The lady exclaimed, "My dear, have you scratched your face? What is that very strange red mark on your cheeks?"

> At this speech, Mary coloured in reality, and her forehead and neck became almost as red as her face. She turned to her mamma; but her mamma, instead of relieving her distress, repeated Mrs. Beresford's question, and insisted on knowing what had happened to her. Mary

> tried to whisper her mamma, but she was not allowed to do it; and at last she was obliged to say: "Ma'am, it is only some rouge." She laughed heartily, and her mamma laughed at her, and all the ladies and the little girls laughed too: even a dog who was sitting by the fire-side, hearing them all laugh, came and barked a merry bark at poor Mary. Then she felt so sadly ashamed, that she wished she had Fortunatus's cap, to make herself invisible; or that a Fairy would come in at the window and carry her away. But those stories about Fortunatus and Fairies are only made out of people's own heads, to amuse children; and even if there were Fairies, which there are not, they would do nothing to help a naughty, vain little girl. Mary's mamma was quite ashamed of her too, and she asked for a towel and a basin of water and washed the paint from her daughter's cheeks before them all. Mary cried, and sat down at a great distance from the company, and hoped they would forget she was there: she would not even sob aloud, for fear they should look round at her.[87]

Mary's humiliation was not yet complete, for when her mamma took her home, "there she was again disgraced, for her papa, and all her sisters and brothers, and even her nurse, were informed of her folly." Her humiliation was made complete by isolation and withdrawal of love and support, for her papa and her mamma

> resolved that she should not be spoken to by any body, nor be looked at by any body, except when it was necessary; and that every one should seem to forget her, and pay her as little attention as possible, till she was quite cured of her vanity, and till she had learned that good-humour and obliging manners, were more likely to gain esteem, than rouge and fine dress.[88]

In "Charlotte," another of Mamma's Stories, a little girl was locked in her room and deprived of her supper after she had run away for an hour or two. This punishment was not enough, however. Her mother was determined that the episode would never be repeated, and so humiliated the child:

> The next morning her mamma came and unlocked the door, and staid by her while the nurse dressed her. Charlotte hardly dared to look at her mamma, because she thought she would look so angry; but a last she lifted up her

> eyes and saw a long black string in her mamma's lap. "Now, nurse," said her mamma, "you must fasten these leading strings around Miss Charlotte's waist and arms, and we must lead her about like a little baby, since she has not more sense than to run away as a baby would."
> Charlotte was sadly ashamed to be led down to breakfast like an infant; but she knew she deserved this punishment, and she said nothing. She could not eat much breakfast, not withstanding her hunger, because she thought her mamma looked so sorry, and everybody looked so angry at her. Whenever her mamma went out of the room she locked the door because she could not trust her little girl. This mortified her even more than wearing leading strings, and at last she said: "My dear mamma, pray to trust in me once more, and I will wear the leading strings and stay in a corner till I am eight years old, and submit to every punishment you please; and I will never be so naughty as to run away and tell stories any more."[89]

Intrusion was another form of psychological discipline used in the literature. Examples of intrusive behavior in which the parent tried to invade the privacy or inner life of the child, can be found in literature written for both children and adults. As would be expected, criticism of intrusiveness is found in adult literature rather than in children's literature.[90] Intrusiveness in the nineteenth century family is discussed extensively by Stone in The Family, Sex and Marriage in England 1500 - 1800, and Kern in his article "Explosive Intimacy: Psychodynamics of the Victorian Family." It is an essential element in their argument that the nineteenth century family was a "stifling fortress of emotional bonding."[91]

Intrusive behavior could take a variety of forms. One of the commonest methods used by parents to monitor their children's behavior was the diary. Diaries were popular with both adults and children in the nineteenth century.[92] They were especially popular in religious families, and indeed, were encouraged by John Wesley as an aid to self-examination. Only through constant self-examination could one hold sin at bay. In the literature, children were given diaries for birthdays, special occasions or even, as in the case of Lucy Fairchild, after a serious incident of disobedience. In the latter instance, although Lucy had come to see the error of her ways, Mrs. Fairchild was not satisfied. As Mrs. Sherwood wrote:

> Then Mrs. Fairchild went to a drawer, and took out a book neatly bound in red leather: there was nothing written in the book; the leaves were all blank. This book she gave to Lucy, and she said, "Here, my dear; take this book, and write in it every day the naughty things which pass in your heart. You will then find, my dear, that many days, when you may appear to be very good in the eyes of your papa and mamma, and of other people, you are in reality in the sight of God very naughty. This custom, my dear child, will teach you to know your own heart and it will keep you from being proud, and thinking better of yourself than of other people."[93]

The diary had the desired effect:

> Lucy went up to her room, to write down in her new book the things she had been thinking of that morning. When Lucy took out her book and began to consider what to write, she was surprised to find, that although she had appeared to be good in the eyes of her parents all day, having read well, and worked well, and been quiet and civil, yet all this time her heart had been full of evil thoughts and wicked passions: and now she began to feel, what she had often heard without attending to it, "that the heart is deceitful above all things, and desperately wicked: who can know it?" (Jer. xvii. 9). "Oh, I am a wicked child!" she said to herself;"I am a wicked girl! Who can save me from my own wicked heart! But I will write down all I have thought this morning, and shew it to my mamma."[94]

Lucy did indeed show the diary to her mother whose comment was "happy are those, my dear Lucy, who are brought to the knowledge of their own sinful nature whilst they are young."[95] Mrs. Fairchild told her daughter to "continue every day to keep an account of what passed in her heart, that she might learn more and more to know and hate her own sinful nature." Mother and daughter then knelt together, confessing before God, "the exceeding vileness of their hearts."[96]

Diaries ensured that children remained in constant communication with their souls. This constant practice of self-examination had the effect of making some children tense, anxious, and morbidly religious.[97] In The History of the Fairchild Family, little Emily was terribly, morbidly tormented by the dreadful all-seeing Eye of God after she had wickedly eaten some of her mother's damascenes:

> Her sleep was disturbed by dreadful dreams, such as she had never had before in her life. She fancied she had been doing something wrong, though her head was so confused that she did not know what, and that a dreadful Eye was looking upon her from above. Wherever she went, she thought this Eye followed her with angry looks, and she could not hide herself from it. It was her troubled conscience, together with an uneasy body, which gave her these dreadful dreams; and so horrible were they that at length she awoke screaming violently.[98]

Didactic writers presented relationships which, from a twentieth century point of view may be interpreted as intrusive and stifling, but the writers themselves did not criticize these relationships as the following examples from The Sister's Friend by Mrs. Cameron (1831), and The Blind Farmer and His Children by Barbara Hofland indicate:

> Mary-Anne sat down by her mother, who accustomed to watch every change in the countenance of her children was well aware that something now lay upon her mind, but she wished to invite confidence rather than press it. "My dearest child," said she, "have you had a pleasant visit, and were your friends kind to you?"[99]

The mother then proceeded to draw out her daughter. In the second example, the farmer's son wished to work for an artist. His father gave his permission in the following manner:

> I give it... on one condition only, which is, that you regularly spend the Sabbath-day with your own family; --your regularity and good conduct, your affection to your parents and family is of the last importance, and this can only be insured by our continuing to associate together, and spending our time in the service of God --for although you are now my dear Frank, a very good child, yet you are so volatile and enthusiastic, that it I know is necessary to watch over you and give you all the protection my sad situation allows.[100]

Little needs to be said at this point concerning the last method of discipline of the nonphysical type, "withdrawal of support." This method was explained and discussed with a number of examples in the sections dealing with parental types and parent-child relationships. As noted above, withdrawal of love and support seems to have been one of the most commonly used techniques for instilling obedience, dutifulness, docility, industry, and other desirable virtues in children. It was the major characteristic of controlling parent-child relationships, and it was used extensively by paternalistic and maternalistic parental types.

Withdrawal of love and support was often used in combination with other methods of discipline, particularly psychological methods, as the two examples from Mamma's Stories indicate. For example, just before Mary and her mamma left Mrs. Beresford's to go home, where Mary was to face physical and psychological isolation, Mary's mamma shook little Louisa Beresford's hand, kissed her, and said for all to hear:

> My dear Louisa...we can all kiss and love you, because you do not disgust us by pride and vanity: you have been very kind in taking notice of Mary, but she is not worthy to be your companion, and she shall never come to see you any more, till her sufferings have taught her to despise herself and to amend her character.[101]

Mary's enforced isolation from her family was, as the author wrote, "a great trial to Mary":

> for though she loved dress, she loved her sisters better; and they loved her, but they loved their mamma still more; and, as they had been forbidden to play with Mary, they would not be disobedient.[102]

Mary felt the withdrawal of love and support and the isolation most cruelly. The method was thorough, and it must be said, most effective. As the author wrote:

> Her nurse did not look at her with the fondness she used to do, and when she was dressing her, she used to sigh, and say, "Ah, Miss Mary, if I had not indulged your little pride when you were quite a baby, you would not have disgraced yourself and me, at seven years old, and have made everybody laugh at you, and look down upon us both as they do now." Her papa did not call her to sit on his knee when he was telling stories to her sisters; for he said, he made his stories for merry, artless children, and not for fine ladies, who painted their cheeks. Even her dear mamma, who used always to look so sorry when she had punished them, and who had never "let the sun go down on her wrath" before, but had always forgiven and kissed her children before they went to bed, now seemed hardly ever to think even of Mary; and never smiled when she looked at her, nor stroked her head, nor patted her cheek, nor kissed her forehead at all. Poor Mary felt all this neglect very deeply, and as she knew that it was owing to her fondness for dress and vanity, she thought with horror of all kinds of finery, and looked upon all the sashes and muslin frocks she happened to have, as so many enemies to her real happiness. She was never afterwards seen to look in a mirror, nor heard to prefer one bonnet to another; and, by slow degrees, her humility and repentance made her parents pity her, and they allowed the other children to include her in their plays. Still her heart was heavy, for she remembered her sad disgrace, and she thought her papa and mamma remembered it too. They said, "We cannot quite forget, that one of our little girls has added the folly of grown up people to the faults which belong to childhood;

> but we will try to forget it, as she seems trying to improve herself." Mary hoped they would try very hard to forgive her, and she tried very earnestly to merit it; but she could not quite forget what had passed herself, and long after her friends had ceased to reproach her, whenever they looked at her with more gravity than usual, her conscience whispered a fear, that they were thinking of her painted cheeks.[103]

In "Charlotte" the withdrawal of love and support was hardly less punishing. After Charlotte was "found"[104] her mamma took her into the house "without speaking a word." Then

> When Charlotte was in the nursery, her mamma had her undressed and put to bed. Then she came into the room and said: "Charlotte, I think I am more grieved to find that you have been such a naughty and silly child, than I should have been, even if we had lost you entirely, for now I have lost all my confidence in you. I cannot depend on your good behavior, nor on your affection; and I cannot have the pleasure of loving you as dearly as I did before." Then she went out of the room and locked the door, that the little girl might not run away again. But Charlotte did not wish to run away any more; she only wished she had never been naughty, and wished her dear mamma could forgive her.[105]

When forgiveness came, it was incomplete and conditional. It was hardly better than no forgiveness at all, at least from the modern adult reader's point of view, for it placed a tremendous burden on the child, and increased rather than decreased the anxiety and insecurity the child must have felt. Note the "ifs," "perhaps," and "mays" in the mother's reply to Charlotte's plea for forgiveness:

> I hope, Charlotte, you are convinced of the folly as well as the wickedness of attempting to pass for what you are not.--If you had waited patiently till "the burden of your natural years fell on you," you would have been loved in your childhood, and pleasantly assisted in gaining the wisdom and knowledge which you will be expected to possess when you are older. Instead of which, you have made yourself ridiculous and

> contemptible, by telling falsehoods, and by trying to pass for a woman before you had strength of mind or of body, or sense enough, for anything but a child. It will be very long before we can quite forgive your ill-conduct; but if you endeavor to deserve and to regain our confidence, and never allow your vanity to lead you into falsehood or passion, perhaps, by the time you are eight years old, you may have won back our entire love and esteem, and we may then think your errors effaced by your sorrow and amendment.[106]

Perhaps withdrawal of love and support was the cruelest form of punishment. Not only were the unhappy children isolated, deprived of food and childish pleasures, they were also bluntly told that they were not loved or would not be loved: "force me not...to despise you," said Rosa's father in Right and Wrong, "I cannot have the pleasure of loving you as deeply as I did before..."; "You have made yourself ridiculous and contemptible," said Charlotte's mother; "We can all kiss and love you, because you do not disgust us by pride and vanity," said Mary's mother to another child in the presence of her own. As the examples suggest, this method of discipline seldom failed to have the desired effect. It is likely that it was highly successful in real families too. Only the most hardened child, or the child who had it "done" to him too many times could have resisted.

It can never be known to what extent these six methods of discipline were actually used in pre-Victorian families. However, their appearance in literature designed to teach, literature that emphasized truth and honesty as virtues to be emulated, indicates that even some of the examples that appear particularly extreme or cruel to modern readers, were not unheard of at the time. As it has been argued in this thesis, the very nature and purpose of this kind of literature precludes invention. These stories were not fantasies or fairy tales, and indeed most of these didactic authors abhorred such literature. If these writers were to fulfill their purpose in teaching morality and virtue to children, they had to present only what all knew could and did exist. This is why this kind of literature may be regarded as a reasonably accurate and valuable presentation of pre-Victorian family life.

The evidence in the literature pertaining to methods of discipline is complemented by autobiographical and biographical evidence, letters and diaries, and it supports in essentials the theories of family historians like Lawrence Stone who argue that discipline in the nineteenth century was both "frequent and severe."

V. Sibling Relationships

Parents have long understood that the nature of the parent-child relationship can determine the nature of sibling relationships. If all the children in a particular family are treated equally, are made to feel equally loved and cherished, the degree of rivalry and strife within a family is greatly reduced. In fictional families, as in real families, it is not always easy to make all children feel equally loved. For example, even though according to Mrs. Sherwood, "Mr. and Mrs. Fairchild loved their little children dearly"[107] and there was no indication from the author that any one of the three children received special favors from their parents, the children themselves did not always perceive matters so. Although little Lucy had received from her mother only the day before, a pretty leather book to use for a diary, she quickly forgot her own gift and felt slighted and unloved when her brother and sister received gifts the next day:

> Mrs. Fairchild, who was looking over some drawers, gave Emily a little bit of muslin, and about a quarter yard of narrow pink ribbon, to make her doll a cap of.
> Emily ran to shew Lucy what she had got: Lucy said nothing; but she felt vexed that her mamma had not given them to her, instead of Emily.--By this time the breakfast was ready, and Lucy went down, not in the best of tempers: but still she did not say anything by which any one could find out that she was out of humour; for people who are brought up well are taught to keep their ill tempers to themselves.
> When the rest of the family were all seated at the breakfast table, Mr. Fairchild came in from the garden with a very large strawberry on a leaf.
> "Look here, my dear!" said he to Mrs. Fairchild; "what a very large strawberry!"
> "It is indeed," said Mrs. Fairchild.
> As Mr. Fairchild passed by to his chair he popped the strawberry into Henry's bowl of milk, saying "There, my boy, see if you can manage to eat that great strawberry."
> This vexed Lucy again; and she said to herself, "Emily gets muslin and ribbon, and Henry a strawberry; but what do I get?" Then she began to think of a lady who lived not a great way off, who had two little girls, of whom she loved one very much, and hated the other; and it came into her mind that her papa and mamma loved Henry and Emily more than they did herself![108]

As is so often the case, the child's perception of the world differs greatly from that of the adult.

It is the adult point of view, the view of the author, that is the focus of this thesis, and despite Lucy Fairchild's perception of her situation, all the Fairchild children were loved equally by their parents. In the majority of books and stories, this was the image presented by the author. In the ideal family, the happy, stable, loving nurturing and protecting family, all children were the equal recipients of their parents' affection and attention. Unless there was good reason for one child to receive more love and attention from his parents than his brothers or sisters, the parents were highly criticized by the author.

A child who was loving and dutiful, posing a marked contrast to the behavior and attitude of his other siblings, was sometimes considered justly deserving of more affection from his parents. For example, in Mrs. Sherwood's book, The Little Woodman and His Dog Caesar, William, the youngest child, became his father's favorite and with good reason:

> From day to day the poor dying woodman earnestly besought his sons to turn to God; but they mocked at him, and would not hearken to him. He could now work for them no longer, nor provide them with what they wanted, so they followed their own business and pleasure, hardly taking care to furnish their sick father with common food or clothing. One only of all his sons took pity on him, and hearkened to his advice, and waited upon him. This was little William, his youngest child. He was just five years old at the time when the tree fell upon his father, and his heart was not yet grown hard, like the hearts of his brothers.[109]

Good behavior, industriousness, seriousness, and docility were likewise rewarded by increased parental affection in The History of Jane and Eliza Wentworth by Arnaud Berquin (1829), and Right and Wrong by Maria Budden. In both stories, one sister was given more attention, shown more affection than the other. In the former book, Jane was hard-working and diligent, and became very accomplished. She was esteemed by her parents and all who knew her. Her sister, quite opposite in behavior and attitude, was frequently treated like a baby and left at home with her dolls while Jane was taken out to parties by her parents. In Right and Wrong, the twin Agnes was dutiful, docile, and well-behaved, and consequently, much praised by her parents. Her sister Rosa, however, never succeeded in overcoming her faults and as a result, sacrificed her parents' esteem.

Amendment by Catherine Parr Traill and Susanna Moodie presented a slightly different situation than those just described. The eldest child, Charles, was preferred by the father. The latter alternately indulged the child, flattered his vanity, and throughly corrupted the child morally and spiritually. His wife, the child's mother, could do little to counteract his influence; indeed when she had to leave home to visit a sick friend in London, the little boy was delighted, for he hoped to indulge himself all the more in her absence. Clara, the youngest child, was gentle, sweet, docile, and industrious, clearly showing the effect of her mother's affection and attention. The more she demonstrated her goodness, the more the child was loved by her mother, and the greater was her father's and her brother's dislike of her. It was the father rather than the mother who was criticized for the inequality of love. The mother did try to love her difficult child, but as the author indicated, he was hardly deserving of her affection.

In The Willoughby Family by Mrs. Cameron, a stepmother was highly criticized for her failure to love a daughter who had been badly disfigured by smallpox. The patient, sweet nature of the girl won her the love of everyone else, however, and secured her a devoted husband. In Memoirs of Emma and Her Nurse, another book by Mrs. Cameron, a father was criticized for his indifference to his daughter and preference for his son.

Parents, then, were expected to love all their children equally, to show one child no favor over any other. If this was not the case there were good reasons for it. The child was not deserving of his parents' love and attention, or one or both of the parents were not good parents. In the first case, the authors wished to show children that they must earn their parents' love, in the second, an example of bad parenting could be used to show the benefits of good parenting, to demonstrate the desirability of a situation wherein parents were conscious of their duties and responsibilities toward their children, and carried out those duties and responsibilities faithfully and conscientiously. It was generally held that parents were responsible before God for their children's moral and spiritual conduct. It is significant, however, that children were in no way excused for misbehavior due to bad parenting. For example, little Charles in Amendment was not exempt from reproach for his vanity, selfishness, and indolence even though these vices were clearly the result of his father's indulgence. As Susannah's aunt explained to her niece in Mrs. Sherwood's book, Susannah:

> I wish you /Susannah/ to tell me from who a mother receives her authority over her child. I hesitated a little, and then said from God. And which, said she, is the greatest? The God who gives the parent his authority, or the parent who receives the authority from God?

> I answered, certainly the God who gives the authority.
> Then, said she, if a parent is so wicked, after the Almighty has given him his authority to rule and govern his children rightly to neglect or misguide these children, by what superior law should such unhappy children be regulated?
> I replied by the law of God.
> Such being the case, she replied, every child in all situations, whether under the guidance of good or bad parents, of kind or cruel guardians, ought to have one fixed and abiding rule of conduct, and that is the will of God. The word of God, my child, is a sure and certain guide in every situation in life, and now I tell you that by studying this word and endeavouring to act up to it, you will find the means of pleasing me![110]

If all children were made to feel equally loved by their parents, the incidents of sibling rivalry were significantly reduced. If the home ideally was to be a refuge, a place of peace and tranquility, a shelter from the strife and confusion of the world, internal dissension and competition had to be kept to a minimum. In the ideal family, the level of sibling rivalry was not high. In 64 of the 80 fictional families for which there was sufficient information to determine the nature of sibling relationships, the level of sibling rivalry was considered low. Another 5 families were considered to have a moderate level of sibling rivalry. In only 11 of the fictional families was the level of rivalry considered high. Extreme hostility between brothers and sisters and constant prolonged quarrelling indicated a high level of sibling rivalry in a family. Less hostility, fewer quarrels and/ or quarrels that were quickly resolved indicated a moderate level of rivalry. Few or no quarrels, little or no hostility of course indicated a low level of sibling rivalry. Sex did not appear to be a factor in the amount or extent of quarrelling between brothers and sisters. Brothers did not necessarily quarrel more with one another than with their sisters or vice versa. In The History of the Fairchild Family, for example, where a moderate level of rivalry was observed, Lucy and Emily quarrelled as much with Henry as with one another.

The mere example of happy, loving families was not sufficient, however, to impress on juvenile readers the sinfulness of childish quarrelling and rivalry. The books were filled with admonitions, reproaches, and terrible examples of what might happen to children who did not love their brothers and sisters. Many stories included a reference to one or the other of Isaac Watt's famous little songs "Against Quarrelling and Fighting," and "Love Between Brothers and Sisters":[111]

> Let dogs delight to bark and bite,
> For God hath made them so;
> Let bears and lions growl and fight,
> For 'tis their nature too.
>
> But, children, you should never let
> such angry passions rise;
> Your little hands were never made
> To tear each other's eyes.

or:

> Whatever brawls disturb the street,
> There should be peace at home;
> Where sisters dwell and brothers meet,
> Quarrels should never come.
>
> Birds in their little nests agree;
> And 'tis a shameful sight,
> When children of one family,
> Fall out, and chide and fight.
>
> Hard names at first, and threatening words,
> That are but noisy breath,
> May grow to clubs and naked swords,
> To murder and to death.

Of course there were always the inevitable references to Cain and Abel. Thus Mr. Fairchild, after finding his three children quarrelling one morning, whipped each with his rod, quoted the appropriate passage from Divine Songs, and sent them away to reflect on their sinfulness. After a time, he called them to him and said:

> "Do you remember, Lucy--do you remember, Emily...what words you used to each other?"
> "Yes, Papa," they answered; "we said that we hated each other; but we did not mean what we said."
> "Yes," answered Mr. Fairchild, "you did mean what you said at the time; or else why did you bite and scratch each other with all your might, when you spoke?"
> "Oh, Papa!" answered Lucy, "because we were angry then."
> "And suppose," said Mr. Fairchild, "that you had had a knife in your hand, Lucy: in your anger you would have struck your sister with it and perhaps have killed her."
> "Oh! No, Papa! No, Papa!" said Lucy: "I would not kill my poor sister for all the world."
> Mr. Fairchild. "You would not kill her now, I am sure for all the world, because you are not now angry with her; nor would you bite her now, I am sure: but when hatred and anger seize upon persons, they do many shocking things which they would not think of at another time. Have you not read how wicked Cain, in his anger, killed his brother Abel? And do you not remember the verse in 1 John iii.15: "Whosoever hateth his brother is a murderer, and ye know that no murderer hath eternal life abiding in him?"
> "Oh! Papa, Papa!" said Emily; "we will never be angry again."
> "My dear Emily," said Mr. Fairchild, "you must not say that you will never be angry again; but that you will pray to God, in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ your Redeemer, to send his Holy Spirit into your heart to take away these wicked passions."[112]

This discussion was not enough, Mr. Fairchild felt, to fully impress upon his children the wickedness of quarrelling. He took the children to Blackwood to "shew them something there which, I think, they will remember as long as they live: and I hope they will take warning from it, and pray more earnestly for new hearts, that they may love each other with perfect and heavenly love."[113] It will be recalled that what Mr. Fairchild had to show them at Blackwood was a rotting corpse hanging on a gibbet. The corpse was that of a man who had murdered his brother.

It is doubtful that the rocking horse incident in Mary Elliot's book, The Little Wranglers (1825), would have had as lasting an effect on young minds or have been as effective a deterrent to quarrelling as the gibbet episode in The History of the Fairchild Family. Nevertheless, it must have sobered some children. The Little Wranglers is the story of two children, a brother and a sister, who fought continually. The children, known to family and friends as "the little wranglers," for obvious reasons, were particularly jealous of one another's toys. On the occasion of Charles's birthday, his good aunt sent him a beautiful rocking horse. Before the horse brought him any pleasure, however, he fell into a violent quarrel with his sister. In the course of the quarrel, Charles was severely injured and was confined to bed. His sister was stricken with remorse and did her best to make amends. Charles did recover, but neither he nor his sister had a chance to ride on the beautiful rocking horse, for when their aunt heard of their misbehavior, she took back her gift. The children learned a valuable lesson from the unfortunate incident, however. As Charles's sister said:

> I am sorry that good Mrs. Bennet thought us so wicked when she took away the rocking horse; but if we love each other and leave off our bad habits, she will, perhaps, give us back her love, and that will be better than a wooden horse.[114]

The author added her own observation that "brothers and sisters who wrangle are sinning against the commands of our maker and therefore must be doing what is wicked."[115]

Mr. Jennet in Dorothy Kilner's book, The Holiday Present, had a unique method of dealing with a child who would be rude, selfish, and inconsiderate in his relationships with his siblings rather than loving and pleasant. When Charles took his brother's apple, his father tied the little thief's hands and feet together. Neither this punishment, nor any others appeared to be particularly effective, however, for unlike Charles and Hannah in The Little Wranglers, Charles never really repented. His brothers, by contrast, were good hearted and charitable individuals, who continually pleaded with their father on their brother's behalf. On one occasion, the brothers even went so far as to bring Charles a gift of a beautiful big kite in spite of the latter's selfishness and rudeness. Charles had no chance to play with his gift, though, because he was tied up.

In Mrs. Cameron's book, The History of Little Frank and His Sister, love for one's brothers and sisters was highly emphasized. As the author wrote in her introduction:

> These children had a very good papa and mamma, who took great pains with them; and under their care, by God's blessing, they were learning to be wise and good, and like all good and wise children, they loved each other very much; and if they ever had a quarrel, they were not happy until they made it up again. Even little Frank, before he was three years old had learned the meaning of that verse:--
>
> "Whatever brawls disturb the street,
> There should be peace at home:
> Where sisters dwell and brothers meet,
> Quarrels should never come.[116]

The main focus of the book was on brotherly and sisterly love. The kindness of Sophia to her little brother Frank was emphasized and contrasted to the behavior of Matilda, a friend who made fun of Sophia on account of the latter's solicitude for her brother. Matilda herself quarrelled continually with her brother. Because of their constant quarrelling, the brother was sent away to school where he became ill and died. Matilda had, in effect, caused her brother's death.

Older children were encouraged to have patience in their interaction with younger brothers and sisters, to endure and tolerate the younger ones' trespasses. For example, in The Warren Family by S.W. (1813; 1814), Mrs. Warren counteracted her daughter's despair when her little brother damaged the new wall paper she had laboriously put up to decorate her room in the following way:

> How I wish I could impress upon your mind the lesson Dr. Watts teaches in these two excellent lines:
> "What's amiss I'll strive to mend;
> And endure what can't be mended."
> Let us all try to adopt them for our motto, and constantly to act upon them....We must not allow ourselves to suppose that our tempers and dispositions can't be mended, because by care and watchfulness we know that they may. However, it is a work of labour and time; and therefore I would advise Lucy to prepare herself to endure with patience, and without being too much discouraged, the difficulties she may meet with in the task. But to the end of our lives we must go on striving to mend ourselves and never indulge the thought that we can't be mended.[117]

Older siblings were also encouraged to protect the younger ones, and perhaps even indulge them, as Sophia indulged her sister Soffrona's whims and helped her with her tasks in Mrs. Sherwood's book, Soffrona and Her Cat Muff.

One of the happiest presentations of ideal sibling relationships was found in Maria Budden's book, Always Happy!!!

The following passages illustrate what the author considered to be the characteristics of a beautiful brother-sister relationship:

> /Felix and his sister/ loved each other tenderly, and were happy in having kind parents, who were always attentive to their improvement and happiness.
>
> Felix met his sister in the parlour, and they talked over the pleasures of the coming day;...Serena's frock was as white as snow, her cheeks just washed with clear cold water, bloomed like two roses, her hair was nicely combed and hung in easy curls on her clear forehead, and her eyes sparkled with good humour--Felix as he kissed her could not help thinking that all the fine clothes in the world would not have made her look better than she now did....[118]

On a visit to their grandparents' home, Felix and Serena witnessed the behavior of four cousins quarrelling over toys. The behavior of the cousins served to highlight by contrast the goodness of Felix and Serena:

> The four cousins became more cross every minute; they scolded each other for what was the fault of all; and at last, their passion made them so forgetful of themselves, that from words they proceded to blows. What sight can be more shocking! Four brothers and sisters, fighting and beating each other!--Poor Serena, turned pale with fear, and throwing her arms around her brother seemed to cling to him for protection. Felix tenderly kissed her, and holding her firmly in his stouter arms, assured her nothing should hurt her.[119]

And when Felix was to leave for school, Serena occupied herself in making things for him, "preparing for his future comfort":

> His neat new handkerchiefs were of her hemming, his silk purse she had netted, and with her own hands fresh lined the deal box that was to contain his books.[120]

Serena cared for her brother's garden and his rabbits while he was away, and knitted him numerous pairs of socks. When

Felix was at last to return home, her mother noted that Serena had had the satisfaction of having served her brother.[121]

VI. Conclusion

1. Preamble

However modern historians may perceive the nineteenth century family, contemporaries viewed it in a highly positive light. With scarcely an exception, the didactic authors portrayed the family and family life as highly desirable. They did indeed see the home, as Ruskin did, as "the place of Peace," the family as a shelter, a refuge. In some books, such as Correspondence between a Mother and her Daughter at School by Ann and Jane Taylor, the ideal earthly home was even compared to the heavenly home. Whether or not the family and the home were as free of anxieties as Ruskin and others would have liked them to be is another question. Despite the authors' emphasis on peace in the home, gentleness, submission, and duty, they do not quite dispel the suspicion that anxiety and tension were very much a part of day-to-day life. The preoccupation with sin and the state of the soul, the determination to break the will of the child, albeit for the child's own spiritual and moral welfare, the fear and insecurity, the utter misery recorded by the authors themselves, of the child who has sinned or disappointed his parents, suggest that the peaceful, tranquil, loving home was an ideal to be longed for, aspired to, but seldom if ever in reality achieved. But one must approach this didactic literature cautiously. There is clearly in the literature evidence to support a number of theories, including Ariès's argument that the nineteenth century family was a "prison of love," Kern's theory that nineteenth century family life was characterized by "explosive intimacy," Stone's claim that the post-1800 family was a "stifling fortress of emotional bonding," and Ruskin's belief that the family hearth was "shade as of the rock in a weary land, and light as of the Pharos in the stormy sea."

2. The Family in Nineteenth Century England

In the overwhelming majority of families portrayed in pre-Victorian children's literature, the husband or the father was the dominant figure. This relationship is consistent with historical interpretation. Lawrence Stone and other historians, such as Gordon Rattray Taylor,[122] have argued that the nineteenth century saw a revival in emphasis on paternal authority after a period of relative permissiveness during the eighteenth century. In his discussion of post-1800 family types, Stone writes:

> In England an era of reinforced patriarchy and discipline lasted from about 1530 to 1670, with the high point in the 1650's. This in turn gave way to an era of growing individualism and permissiveness which was dominant in the middle and upper classes from about 1670 - 1790. The next stage in the evolution of the family was marked by a strong revival of moral reform, paternal authority, and sexual repression, which was gathering strength among the middle classes from about 1770.[123]

He continues:

> The key institution upon which this new moral Puritanism was concentrated was the family. 'Home is the first and most important school of character,' remarked Samuel Smiles....The driving force behind this movement was the spread of Evangelical piety. God was again seen as directly controlling day-to-day events within the household, in which capacity he was a severe and

> pitiless masculine figure. His representative on earth was the husband and father, who now acquired a new and significant title: the 'Paterfamilias,' the man who by the 1840's once more led the family prayers three times a day. 'It was constantly emphasized that the will of the parent was the will of God....The more religious a father was, the more likely was he to make this confusion between his own inclinations and the divine purpose.'[124]

However, as it was noted in this chapter, the paterfamilias was expected to use his authority wisely and judiciously. As Ann Taylor stated in her book, The Family Mansion, the domestic tyrant "may be generally classed among the incurables." Let domestic tyrants know, she wrote, "they must never hope to experience the genuine pleasures and rational delights of a Family Mansion." The husband and father was "bound to cherish and protect" and to be "the tender guardian and solace of his family."[125]

Thus while the literature does bear out Stone's emphasis on paternal authority, discipline, and the association of the parental will with the divine will, there is another side to the picture of paternal authority which Stone and others have not emphasized. Gentleness and kindness were also demanded of the paterfamilias as many examples from the literature have indicated. The majority of husband-wife relationships were perceived to be loving and supportive even though the husband was the dominant partner, and in parent-child relationships, most incidents of paternal severity were balanced with incidents of paternal tenderness. It is significant that little Henry Fairchild, at the height of his isolation from his family for disobeying his father, sorrowfully remembered how his father used to let him ride on his foot. And Mr. Fairchild was not alone among the stern authoritarian fathers presented in the literature who was quick to punish a disobedient child but just as quick to kiss that child when sincere repentance was demonstrated. It is interesting that such sterness and tenderness in the same individual were not considered incompatible.

This juxtaposition of contrasting characteristics was a dominant element in the internal relationships presented in the literature. But this association of sterness and tenderness in the literature reflected what appears to have been actual characteristics of nineteenth century family relationships. It would seem that nineteenth century husbands and fathers admitted more gentleness in their relationships with their wives and children than is often thought. In general, there was probably a good deal more happiness and light in nineteenth century families than many historians have suggested.

It is known, for example, from surviving letters, diaries, and autobiographies, that for all the injustices in the marital relationships, many nineteenth century men and women were deeply happy in their marriages. The domination of one marriage partner over the other did not necessarily produce an intolerable situation, and as the didactic literature suggests, domestic tyranny was disapproved of. Eminent Victorians, such as the Kingsleys and the Wilberforces, and indeed the Queen herself, found great contentment within the bonds of marriage. Even that tortured soul, Charlotte Brontë eventually found in her brief marriage the peace and happiness for which she had yearned for so many years. Married rather late in life to a "very practical, as well as a very punctual and methodical man," to use Charlotte's own words, a man who did not really understand her or her temperament, and who insisted on examining her personal correspondence, she nonetheless found comfort and security in her relationship. If her personal letters are an accurate indication of her true feelings, she did not chafe unduly at his restrictions, his demands on her time, but instead took pleasure in his kindness and affection.[126]

Charlotte Brontë's stern but tender, loving and supportive relationship with her husband was probably more common that otherwise. This kind of relationship was considered desirable enough to be idealized in children's literature. Maria Budden's portrayal of a loving and supportive relationship between a husband and wife in Always Happy!!! was a good example of this idealization.[127] As it was observed in this chapter, a warm, loving, and supportive relationship between husband and wife was recognized to be ideal for the nurture of children. A strong relationship between the parents helped butress the family against the world and facilitated the teaching of desired values. No doubt this is why it predominated in the literature and was emphasized by didactic writers.

On the basis of the evidence in the literature, which emphasized a loving and supportive relationship between the husband and wife and encouraged gentleness and kindness in the husband and father, combined with examples from the lives of contemporaries, it seems reasonable to argue that the generally accepted image of the Victorian paterfamilias needs some alteration. This image has been overbalanced on the side of strictness, discipline, and authority. The Victorian paterfamilias has been represented as remote, domineering, overbearing, and awesome. His more human characteristics have not been so well explored and presented. The Mr. Gradgrinds and Theobald Pontifexes of literature have exerted too much influence on the generally accepted image of the paterfamilias. This image has not been improved by portraits of James Mill and Philip Gosse by their famous sons. John Stuart Mill's Autobiography and Edmund Gosse's Father and Son deliberately emphasize the sterner characteristics of their fathers. Under the influence of these examples, it is easy to forget that these men were hardly typical individuals, let alone husbands and fathers, and that even these men were not totally devoid of warmth.[128]

Beyond these general remarks, something further must be said about parent-child relationships in the nineteenth century. To return to Stone's argument:

> The...patriarchal trend /in the nineteenth century/ affected parent-child relations, while authoritarianism again became strongly marked, with a renewed stress on the pre-eminence of the father, and the subordination of the children. The family became increasingly, "a stifling fortress of emotional bonding," while relations between parents and children grew more intrusive. Supervision was more intense and oppressive since it was now motivated by an intense religious zeal. The seventeenth-century Puritan theory of the innate sinfulness of the child was revived, and Hannah More argued that it was "a fundamental error to consider children as innocent beings whose little weaknesses may, perhaps,

> want some correction, rather than as beings who bring into the world a corrupt nature and evil dispositions, which it should be the great end of education to rectify." This movement began in Evangelical circles, linking up with a continuous Wesleyan tradition that in turn was rooted in late seventeenth-century Puritanism. This connection is shown by its forceful appearance as early as 1770 in a leading Evangelical publication, The Gospel Magazine or Spiritual Library. Its readers were told that "in order to form the mind, the first necessary step is to conquer and effectually subdue the natural perverseness of the stubborn will ....I must insist on conquering the wills of children betimes." The way to break their spirit was laid out in chilling detail: "Never commend them when present ....Let them have nothing to cry for....Never let them choose their victuals....From a year old, make them do as they are commanded, if you chastise them ten times running to effect it. Let none persuade you it is cruel to do thus....The carnal world cry loudly against this..., vainly thinking it arises from tyranny and cruelty."[129]

As Stone notes, the child-rearing advice published in The Gospel Magazine or Spiritual Library is very similar to that given in 1732 by Susanna Wesley to her famous son, John Wesley. Mrs. Wesley was a great believer in early childhood education. In the case of her own children she stated, "When turned a year old (and some before) they were taught to fear the rod and cry softly." As a result of her firm measures, "that most odious noise of the crying of children was rarely heard in the house, but the family usually lived in as much quietness as if there had not been a child among them."[130] John Wesley repeated her advice in 1783 in a sermon on the education of children.[131] His works were of course republished throughout the nineteenth century. One should not associate this emphasis on breaking the will of the child with the Evangelicals alone, however. As John Stuart Mill's autobiography indicates, it was a precept favored by the Utilitarians as well, a group very much philosophically opposed to the Evangelicals.

Prevalent as these concepts of childhood and child-rearing practice noted by Stone may have been, the very forcefulness of the language and tone used by the Wesleys and the author of the article in The Gospel Magazine suggest that not all parents held such opinions. Perhaps it was felt that strong words were needed to convince wavering or careless parents. Why else would an author of an essay on the education of children published in 1814 write:

> But are children indeed so depraved from the birth; are they naturally so corrupt; that the parent's recording their little foibles, and occasional sallies of harmless passion without any strong disapprobation, is to be accounted sinful, and as affording evidence of his own depravity? Such and similar, questions are often asked and they amount to pretty strong evidence that the person, who asks them, is himself very far gone in depravity; or at least has been a very inattentive observer of his children's temper and disposition. We often hear parents calling their children "harmless creature," "pretty innocents," and other fond and endearing names which figuratively denote the same thing, such as "little doves," "harmless birds," with a thousand other equivalent appellations; and, I confess, I never hear them without trembling, lest those, their unfledged offspring, should prove birds of evil omen, if not birds of prey, fitted to be taken themselves at last in the snare of the fowler.[132]

Stone's argument implies that such concepts of childhood and child-rearing practices as he describes were both consistent across the middle and upper classes and uniformly severe, that parents from the late eighteenth century forward followed the precepts of the Wesleys consistently, and that there was no development or change in educational thought and practice among parents from that time. The literature written and published for children in the pre-Victorian period alone suggests that Stone's argument may be too simple, too general. It was noted above, for example, that a number of stories were optimistic in tone, indicating remarkable faith on the part of the author, and presumably the reader as well, in the possibility of the regeneration and reformation of human nature. Sinful, indolent, disobedient, and otherwise naughty children were not necessarily doomed to eternal depravity. A "bad start" could be overcome or counteracted. Even dissipated adults could be reformed in the literature. This is not the hopeless, pessimistic doctrine preached by many seventeenth century Puritans like James Janeway or even nineteenth century Puritans or Evangelicals such as the anonymous author of the essay on education last quoted.[133] Even the tone of Mrs. Sherwood's books did not remain constant. Stone singles out The History of the Fairchild Family published first in 1818 as a certain guide to parental attitudes toward children in the nineteenth century. He writes:

> The moral of this book is that children are by nature depraved creatures, that every slip is a grievous sin against God, and that the appropriate punishment is confinement in a dark closet. As substitutes for Cinderella, Jack the Giant Killer or Mother Goose, Mrs. Sherwood's books ushered in a new era in middle- and upper-class reading.[134]

It is true that there is a heavy emphasis on childhood depravity in The History of the Fairchild Family and that the book is rich in sensational examples of methods of discipline, many of which have been noted in this chapter. But it would appear that The History of the Fairchild Family is the only work by Mrs. Sherwood that Stone has read, unless he chooses not to note that her books for children became far.

more optimistic in tone as her literary career advanced. Some of her later stories, such as *Soffrona and Her Cat Muff* were quite pleasant and delightful even with their mandatory moral. As M. Nancy Cutt writes in her study of Mrs. Sherwood and her books for children:

> In ten years [from the date of the original publication of *The History of the Fairchild Family*] Mrs. Sherwood's vision of the child's world had undergone radical change. The children themselves had not perhaps altered very much; Soffrona and Sophia resemble Lucy and Emily Fairchild and come from a similar home. But the world around them is more spacious and far happier.[135]

Stone might also have noted that *The History of the Fairchild Family* was written just after Mrs. Sherwood's return from India where she and her husband had lived for ten years. Those ten years must have been one of the most difficult and painful periods of Mrs. Sherwood's life. Not only did she lose two of her children to the rigors of the climate and the living conditions, she also witnessed the misery, wretchedness, and deaths of many more children, both British and native. It is not surprising, therefore, that her earlier works focused on the uncertainty and the shortness of life, and on human misery, sinfulness, and depravity. Her trials must certainly count for much of her religious morbidity.

Stone criticizes methods of child-rearing in the nineteenth century and makes very little attempt to explain or understand those practices which now seem so cruel, unreasonable, and even sadistic. But Stone is not alone here. What he and others seem to ignore is the dreadful urgency behind nineteenth century methods of child-rearing and literature like The History of the Fairchild Family. The following passage from The History of the Fairchild Family may read as a statement of deep parental love and concern for their little children rather than as simply an example of morbid religiosity and unhealthy obsession with childish sin and depravity:

> Mr. and Mrs. Fairchild loved and feared God and had done so, by the mercy of God, ever since their younger days. They knew that their hearts were very bad, and that they could not be saved by any good thing they could do: on the contrary, that they were by nature fitted only for everlasting punishment: but they believed in the Lord Jesus Christ, and loved him for having died for them; and they knew that he would save them, because he saves all those people who trust in him. They believed also in the Holy Spirit of God--that it enters into the wicked hearts of men, and it makes them good: and they knew that they could not do anything well without the help of this Holy Spirit; therefore they used to pray for the Holy Spirit every day: and their prayers were heard, for they were helped to be good every day. Mr. and Mrs. Fairchild loved their little children dearly; but they did not wish them to be handsome, rich, or great: all they desired for them was, that they might be the children of God, and go to heaven when they died.[136]

It appears that Stone has forgotten his own statistics and demographic facts concerning the appalling mortality rates in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. Perhaps "the psychology of sexual repression and its ever-attendant guilt"[137] and/or the mechanisms of projection and reversal were factors contributing to nineteenth century parental concern with sin and depravity. But it is just as possible, and in fact even more probable, that the very high mortality rate had a very important effect on concepts of childhood and parenting. If death is a very real spectre in families, if the chances of losing a child are very great, the chances are likewise great that the condition or state of the soul of the child will be the primary concern of loving parents. It is reasonable to assume that if parents are at all religious,[138] and many, feeling the effects of the Evangelical revival undoubtedly were even deeply religious, they will use any means they can to attain their ends, to wrest that childish soul from Satan, ~~to~~ protect it from everlasting pain and misery. Pain in the present is nothing to pain that is everlasting.

It is not necessary to argue that parents were cruel, sadistic, or sexually and psychologically repressed. Can it be proved that Susanna Wesley was not sincere in her concern for the happiness and welfare of children when she wrote:

> As self-will is the root of all sin and misery, so whatever cherishes this in children ensures their after wretchedness and irreligion: whatever checks and mortifies it, promotes their future happiness and piety. This is still more evident if we consider that religion is nothing else than doing the will of God and not our own; that the one grand impediment to our temporal and eternal happiness being this self-will, no indulgence of it can be trivial, no denial unprofitable. Heaven or hell depends on this alone; so that the parent who studies to subdue it in his child works together with God in the renewing and saving a soul. The parent who indulges it does the Devil's work; makes religion impracticable, Salvation unattainable, and does all that in him lies to damn his child body and soul forever.[139]

Many nineteenth century parents took these views deeply to heart and acted upon them in good faith.

However cruel some of these methods of discipline may seem today, to nineteenth century parents they were clearly reasonable, just, and necessary. The ends justified the means. If viewing the rotting corpse of a murderer had the effect of discouraging quarrelling among brothers and sisters, as one may reasonably expect it did, then whatever psychological distress it might have caused was certainly worth it, for in the process a child's soul might be seized and rescued from eternal pain. It cannot be assumed that nineteenth century parents were heartless, cruel, and unloving in their treatment of their children.

Stone argues that the family in the late eighteenth and nineteenth centuries "became increasingly 'a stifling fortress of emotional bonding'" and that "relations between parents and children grew more intrusive." It is probable that his view of parental intrusiveness derives from Lloyd deMause's theory of the evolution of childhood. In his essay, which predates Stone's massive volume by four years, deMause situates his Intrusive Mode of parenting in the eighteenth century--slightly early for Stone's theory, but not unworkably so, since deMause does allow some flexibility in periodization. DeMause describes the Intrusive Mode as follows;

> A tremendous reduction in projection and the virtual disappearance of reversal was the accomplishment of the great transition for parent-child relations which appeared in the eighteenth century. The child was no longer so full of dangerous projections, and rather than just examine its insides with an enema, the parents approached even closer and attempted to conquer its mind, in order to control its insides, its anger, its needs, its masturbation, its very will. The child raised by intrusive parents was nursed by the mother, not swaddled, not given regular enemas, toilet trained early, prayed with but not played with, hit but not regularly whipped, punished for masturbation and made to obey promptly with threats and guilt as often as with other methods of punishment.[140]

There is literary evidence for the intrusive behavior discussed by deMause and Stone. Examples of intrusive behavior, behavior in which the parent tries to invade the inner life of the child, can be found in literature written for both children and adults. Examples of intrusiveness in children's literature were given in this chapter. As would be expected, criticism of intrusiveness is more likely to be found in adult literature.

The sofa conversation initiated by Christina Pontifex in The Way of All Flesh could be considered an example of intrusive behavior in adult literature. Christina, convinced that her son was guilty of a serious moral transgression was determined to ferret out all the details by means of tears, hysterics, or any other tactic necessary. She chose the sofa "as the most suitable ground on which to open her campaign," as she always did when she wanted "a quiet confidential talk," for "the sofa was particularly well adapted for a strategic purpose....Once safely penned into one of its deep corners it was like a dentist's chair, not too easy to get out of again."[141] Butler writes with humor, but humor that is tinged with rancour. He had had personal experience with sofa conversations.

Edmund Gosse was another victim of parental intrusiveness. His father's constant intrusion into Edmund's inner self from infancy to adulthood robbed Edmund of self-confidence. Throughout his childhood and adolescence, Edmund was timid, awkward, anxious, and tense. His physical health as well as his mental health was affected. The intrusion ended only when Edmund forcefully, desperately broke away from his father and, to use Edmund's own words, "took a human being's privilege to fashion his inner life for himself."[142]

Edmund Gosse suffered a severe emotional and spiritual crisis, as did a number of his well known contemporaries such as Samuel Butler and John Stuart Mill, to name two men of letters who have been discussed here. These three men, although dissimilar in most respects, nonetheless had intrusive parents in common. Children's literature does not reflect reality here, for fictional children and adolescents did not suffer from emotional and spiritual crises brought on by intrusive parents. As noted above, although examples of what could be called intrusive behavior are plentiful in children's literature, it is criticized only in adult literature.

The intrusiveness that characterized the behavior of so many nineteenth century parents did stem in part from religious and moral considerations, as it certainly did in the Butler and Gosse families. Many men and women, particularly members of the middle classes, were deeply concerned with questions of religion, morality, and respectability.[143] But as Stephen Kern indicates in his article, "Explosive Intimacy: Psychodynamics of the Victorian Family,"[144] contemporary developments in science and medicine encouraged intrusive parental behavior:

> Confusion about the nature of cultural, infectious, and hereditary transmission from parent to child frequently added to the intensity of the psychological bonds between members of a family. Accordingly, it was believed that if a child's parent was insane, tubercular, or syphlitic, the child would inevitably inherit those problems. The nature of the three ways a parent can transmit germs, genes, or ideas to a child was not precisely understood even in the higher circles of the medical world, and a bewildering tangle of ideas plagued the population. The confusion tended to produce a conception of the family as a biological unit in which the

> values, sex cells, and germs of parents worked in and upon the minds and bodies of children, leaving little room for individual development. Children came to feel trapped in their families fated by the flow of mysterious substances through their bodies to repeat the same vices, catch the same diseases, and inherit the congenital weaknesses of their parents.[145]

Children may indeed have felt trapped in their families, a feeling that must have been heightened by their parents' pathological need, obsession indeed, to know what was going on in their children's minds and bodies.[146]

The intimacy demanded by many parents forged close emotional bonds that only violent rebellion could break. Certainly many children chafed at these bonds. Some, like Gosse, managed to break free. Others, like John Ruskin, never succeeded. In 1864, when the great man of letters was in his forties, he wrote a bitter letter to his elderly parents, criticizing the way in which their possessive, controlling love had crippled him. He was convinced that his life had been wrongly directed and conducted:

> You fed me effeminately and luxuriously to that extent that I actually could not travel in rough countries without taking a cook with me!--but you thwarted me in all the earnest fire of passion and life. About Turner[147] you indeed never knew how much you thwarted me--for I thought it my duty to be thwarted--it was the religion that led me all wrong there--for if I had the courage and knowledge enough to insist on having my own way resolutely, you would now have had me in happy health, loving you twice as much--(for, depend on it, love taking much of its own way, a fair share, is in generous people all the brighter for it--), and full of energy for the future--and of power of self-denial. Now, my power of duty has been exhausted in vain, and I am forced for life's sake to indulge myself in all sorts of selfish ways, just as when a man ought to be knit for the duties of middle life by the good success of his youthful life.[148]

Ruskin's life had been managed by his parents well into middle age. He was both father and mother dominated. Release came only with their deaths. As Ruskin's most recent biographer, Joan Abse demonstrates, Ruskin never really achieved emotional adulthood. He was unable to form healthy relationships with men or women.

Despite the criticism of intrusive, emotionally oppressive family relationships in nineteenth century biographies, autobiographies, diaries, letters and novels, family intimacy, a high level of emotional bonding was considered desirable in children's literature. In this respect, the evidence in children's literature bears out the suggestions of Ariès, Stone and Kern that families in the nineteenth century were close. The level of emotional bonding between members of the family was found to be high or moderate in the majority of cases. In 75 families, the level of emotional bonding was considered high, in 28 moderate, and in only 12 families low. Four fictional families could not be categorized. These figures are not really surprising, since children were admonished to love one another, and quarrelling was considered sinful. Parents were closely in touch with and involved in their children's activities in most of the books and stories examined, as many of the examples used throughout this chapter have indicated. Children were deeply dependent on their parents for love and support. Because duty, obedience, submission, and docility were virtues that were emphasized in the literature, it is little wonder that children were dependent on their parents. Children were trained to be dependent. It could be argued, as Richard Sennett does in Authority, that this respect and dutifulness when given, supported the parental ego, giving the parent a sense of worth and feeling of importance in the child's life. Ironically, this made the parent dependent on the child. Moreover, in many very devout families, parents certainly did depend on their children to help them fulfill their covenant with God. Parents were bound to raise their children to be Godfearing, as children's literature indicates, and pious, dutiful children gave such parents a sense of security in their own salvation.

Thus in families where the level of emotional bonding was high, there was a considerable amount of internal dependency. Members of the Fairchild family, for example, were considered to be highly dependent on one another, and the family was extremely inward looking. The Bensons of Fabulous Histories on the other hand, were only moderately dependent on one another. The children were taught to love and cherish one another, and to respect their parents, but in this family there were fewer internal tensions. Interests were focused more on the outside world. The Benson children, for example, were very much involved with the life of the robin family, and were as interested in its activities as in their own. Their interest led them to a number of philosophical and scientific discussions concerning man, nature, and the proper relationship between the two. The Fairchild children, however, had fewer outside interests. Their primary focus was internal, on their own relationships with one another.

Family intimacy, a high level of emotional bonding were considered desirable in didactic children's literature. Families in which the level of emotional bonding was considered low were not to be emulated. A good example of such a family occurred in Mrs. Sherwood's book, The Little Woodman and His Dog Caesar. Although the father and his youngest son were very close, the other sons were shiftless and evil. No closeness could be expected here. It was hardly a desirable family.

As stated above, there is clearly in didactic children's literature evidence to support a number of theories. Fathers in the literature could be both loving and supportive and distant and cold. Mr. Fairchild is a good example of such a phenomenon. He could dandle little Henry on his knee and also cast him from the bosom of his family. Parents readily whipped their children for childish offences, yet just as readily kissed them and prayed with them when sincere repentance was demonstrated. Parents were solicitous for the state of their children's souls, and therefore they urged confessions and encouraged the keeping of diaries, behaviors that could easily be termed intrusive and deemed psychologically harmful, even sadistic. It is interesting that one body of evidence can support such opposing interpretations. It must be clear that didactic children's literature cannot be used to support any one theory exclusively. But it must be just as clear that this literature does provide valuable insights into the internal relationships of the nineteenth century family.

NOTES

[1] John Ruskin quoted in Walter E. Houghton, The Victorian Frame of Mind 1830 - 1870 (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1975) p. 343. This passage originally appeared in Sesame and Lilies (1865).

[2] Ibid., p. 344.

[3] Samuel Butler, The Way of All Flesh (Penquin Books, 1977). The book was originally written between 1872 and 1884 and published in 1903.

[4] Edmund Gosse, Father and Son (Penquin Books, 1973). Originally published in 1907.

[5] John Ruskin, Praeterita (1885 - 1889). The Oxford University Press edition (1978) contains a good introduction by Kenneth Clark.

[6] Philippe Ariès, Centuries of Childhood. A Social History of Family Life. (New York: Vintage Books, 1965), pp. 406 - 407.

[7] ------, "The Family, Prison of Love," Psychology Today, August, 1975.

[8] Stephen Kern, "Explosive Intimacy: Psychodynamics of the Victorian Family," The Journal of Psychohistory 1 (1974), p. 458.

[9] Ibid., pp. 438 - 441.

[10] Lawrence Stone, The Family, Sex and Marriage in England 1500 - 1800 (New York: Harper and Row, 1977), p. 669.

[11] Richard Sennett, The Fall of Public Man (New York: Vintage Books, 1978), pp. 19 - 20.

[12] Mary Martha Sherwood, The History of the Fairchild Family; or, the children's manual; being a collection of stories calculated to shew the importance and effects of religious education (London: J. Hatchard and Son, 1818), pp. 269 - 270.

[13] Sarah Trimmer, Fabulous Histories, designed for the instruction of children respecting their treatment of animals (Dublin: Printed for Messers. W. Watson, Collis, Wilson, Wogen, White, Byrne, Cash, Marchbank, W. Porter, M'Kenzie Jones and More, 1786), pp. 154 - 155. Many editions were published throughout the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. It was eventually published as Fabulous Histories; or, The History of the Robins (London: N. Hailes, 1818).

[14] Mary Martha Sherwood, The History of Henry Milner, a little boy who was not brought up according to the fashions of this world (London: J. Hatchard and Son, fifth edition, 1835) pp. 23 - 24. This fifth edition, containing three volumes, was published 1831 - 44. It was originally published in four parts 1822 - 37.

[15] ------, Susannah; or, the three guardians (London: Longman, Rees, Orme, Brown, and Green and etc., 1827), p. 77.

[16] Ann Taylor, The Family Mansion, A Tale (London: Taylor and Hessey, 1819), pp. 205 - 206.

[17] Sherwood, Fairchild Family, p. 1

[18] Ibid., p. 3.

[19] Ibid., pp. 4 - 5.

[20] Lucy Lyttelton Cameron, Memoirs of Emma and Her Nurse; or, the History of Lady Harewood (London: Houlston and Son, 1825), p. 10.

[21] Houghton, op. cit., p. 348.

[22] Few Victorians of either sex shared John Stuart Mill's revolutionary ideas on the injustice of the existing relationship between men and women. He argued:

> The principle which regulates the existing social relations between the two sexes--the legal subordination of one sex to another--is wrong in itself, and now one of the chief hindrances to human improvement; and that it ought to be replaced by a principle of perfect equality, admitting no power or privilege on the one side, nor disability on the other.

This quotation is taken from Kate Millet's article, "The Debate over Women: Ruskin vs. Mill," in Suffer and be Still: Women in the Victorian Age edited by Martha Vicinus (Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Press, 1972), p. 124. Mill was highly criticized for his views. As Millet puts it, "he was denounced as mad or immoral, often as both."

[23] "The Angel in the House" (1854, 1856), is the actual title of the poem. Coventry Patmore dedicated the poem to his wife, but it is generally regarded as expressive of "the essential character of Victorian love (though not the only form in the period): the passion that was very much tempered by reverence and confined to the home--that is, to potential or actual marriage--and the object that was scarcely mortal" (Houghton, op. cit., p. 341).

[24] Ruskin in Millet, op. cit., p. 131.

[25] See Joan Abse, *John Ruskin. The Passionate Moralist* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1981).. Abse is Ruskin's most recent biographer.

[26] Ruskin, in Millet, op. cit., p. 126.

[27] Ann and Jane Taylor, *Correspondence between a Mother and her Daughter at School* (London: Printed for Taylor and Hessey, 1817), p. 164.

[28] Maria E. Budden, *Always Happy!!! or, anecdotes of Felix and his sister Serena. A tale. Written for her children, by a mother* (London: J. Harris, 1814), p. 60. There were later editions of this book. The fourth and fifth editions were revised by the author and published in 1820 and 1823 respectively.

[29] Ann and Jane Taylor, *Correspondence*, p. 164.

[30] Budden, *Always Happy!!!*, pp. 111 - 112.

[31] Sherwood, *Fairchild Family*, p. 270. The passage is quoted at length on page 103 of this chapter.

[32] A well known literary example of this type of parent would be Theobald Pontifex, a central character in Samuel Butler's autobiographical novel, *The Way of All Flesh*. As Butler wrote:

> It might have been better if Theobald in his younger days had kicked more against his father: the fact that he had not done so encouraged him to expect the most implicit obedience from his children....[There] was a conviction in Theobald's mind [and in that of his wife Christina] that it was their duty to begin training up their children in the way they should go, even from their earliest infancy. The first signs of self-will must be carefully looked for, and plucked up by the roots at once before they had time to grow. Theobald picked up this numb serpent of a metaphor and cherished it in his bosom.
>
> Before Ernst could well crawl he was taught to kneel; before he could well speak he was taught to lisp the Lord's prayer, and the general confession. How was it possible that these things could be taught too early? If his attention flagged or his memory failed him, here was an ill weed which would grow apace, unless it were plucked out immediately, and the only way to pluck it out was to whip him, or shut him up in a cupboard, or dock him of some of the small pleasures of childhood.... All was done in love, anxiety, stupidity, and impatience (pp. 116 - 120).

The charater of Theobald Pontifex was based on Butler's own father. Another example of the hostile/punitive parent would be James Mill. As his son wrote:

> I...grew up in the absence of love and the presence of fear....I was so much accustomed to expect to be told what to do, either in the form of direct command or of rebuke for not doing it.

(John Stuart Mill, Autobiography and other Writings (New York: Houghton Mifflin, 1969), p. 33.

[33] This mode, assigned to the mid-twentieth century, a much later historical period than that considered in this thesis, is described by deMause as follows:

> The helping mode involves the proposition that the child knows better than the parent what it needs at each stage of its life, and fully involves both parents in the child's life as they work to empathize with and fulfill its expanding and particular needs. There is no attempt at all to discipline or form "habits." Children are neither struck or scolded, and are apologized to if yelled at under stress. The helping mode involves an enormous amount of time, energy, and discussion on the part of both parents, especially in the first six years, for helping a young child reach its daily goals means continually responding to it, playing with it, tolerating its regressions, being its servant rather than the other way around, interpreting its emotional conflicts, and providing the objects specific to its evolving interests. Few parents have yet consistently attempted this kind of child care. From the four books which describe children brought up according to the helping mode, it is evident that it results in a child who is gentle, sincere, never depressed, never imitative or group oriented, strong-willed, and unintimidated by authority.

(Lloyd deMause, "The evolution of Childhood," Lloyd deMause ed.), The History of Childhood (New York: Harper and Row, 1975), pp. 53 - 54.

[34] Edgar White Benson, Education at Home; or a father's instructions (London: Baldwin, Craddock and Joy, 1824) pp. v - vi.

[35] Elizabeth Somerville, James Manners, Little John, and their Dog Bluff (London: Darton, Harvey and Darton, 1818), preface.

[36] See Chapter II of this thesis.

[37] Richard Sennett, Authority (New York: Vintage Books, 1981), p. 82.

[38] Ibid., pp. 50 - 51. This passage has been taken from the following statement:

> The era of high capitalism destroyed in order to build. The growth rate of cities in the nineteenth century, for example, was unprecedented, as was their sheer size.

> For this growth to occur, the countryside was drained of its population; villages were deserted, the land not tilled. But the destruction of the old order did not mean that it was forgotten. Quite the opposite. It was idealized, tarted up, made the subject for regret. The idiocy and harshness of rural life were put out of mind, and the countryside became a place of pastoral ease in which deep and open human relationships seemed once to have existed. Everywhere in the nineteenth century the fragments of the old life which capitalism was shattering were being picked up and treasured as objects all the more precious because they were so vulnerable, too delicate to survive the onslaught of material progress. Just as the village was idealized as a community, the stable family, with the younger generations taking their places in the order custom dictated, was idealized as the seat of virtue. The citizen was offered pastiche as a landscape of authority. Images of broken world were pasted upon a canvas, tinted, and then presented as what trust, security, safety ought to be. Forming a community; belonging to one another--this social need was met with 'It once existed; we used to'...Foremost among the pastiche pictures of authority in the nineteenth century was the image of a father, a father from a more kindly and stable time, superimposed on the image of a boss. This picture of authority is paternalism, as high capitalism had constructed it. Whereas in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries most fathers were in fact the bosses of their children, in farms or businesses run as family enterprises, in the more fragmented and unstable family conditions of the nineteenth century the statement 'The boss is a father' was a metaphor. This paternalistic metaphor was frequently and widely used in the new economy, pasted over the stark material fact that bosses were anything but supportive, protective, loving leaders of their employees (pp. 50 - 51).

[39] Ibid., pp. 15 - 16.

[40] Ibid., p. 54.

[41] The fact that the father's attributes were symbolic rather than material seemed not to matter until that symbol was shaken or proven false. The results could prove disastrous to the one who had come to depend on that symbol, as it did in the case of Edmund Gosse. As an adult, Gosse remembered with significant clarity the effect of his discovery at six years old that his father was not all-knowing:

> I confused [my father] in some sense with God; at all events I believed my father knew everything and saw everything. One morning in my sixth year, my mother and I were alone in the morning-room, when my father

> came in and announced some fact to us. I was standing on the rug, gazing at him, and when he made this statement, I remember turning quickly, in embarassment, and looking into the fire. The shock to me was as that of a thunderbolt, for what my father had said 'was not true'. My mother and I, who had been present at the trifling incident, were aware that it had not happened exactly as it had been reported to him. My mother gently told him so, and he accepted the correction. Nothing could have been more trifling to my parents, but to me it meant an epoch. Here was the appalling discovery, never suspected before, that my Father was not as God, and did not know everything. The shock was not caused by any suspicion that he was not telling the truth as it appeared to him, but by the awful proof that he was not, as I had supposed, omniscient....My father, as a deity, as a natural force of immense prestige, fell in my eyes to a human level. In future, his statements about things in general need not be accepted implicitly (Father and Son, pp. 28 - 30).

Gosse's experience confirms Sennett's argument that the position held by the paternalistic figure is "fraught with dangers." It is a dangerous and explosive situation when too much emotional energy is invested by both individuals, the authority figure and the dependent, in one another. The demands and responsiblities on both sides are too great and they invite negation. The likelihood of either party fulfilling his respective part of the contract to the satisfaction of the other is not great. For the child it means instability. The repeated withdrawal of love and support can cause anxiety and frustration that may erupt into rebellion, rebellion that could become permanent as in the case of Edmund Gosse. Because the key element in this kind of relationship is conditional love and support, Sennett calls paternalism "an authority of false love."

[42] James Janeway, A Token For Children; being an exact account of the conversion, holy and exemplary lives, and joyful deaths of several young children (London: T. Norris and A. Bettesworth, 1711). The book was originally published in 1671 and 1672 and republished many times throughout the seventeenth, eighteenth, and nineteenth centuries. In the preface directed to children the author asks:

> Did you never hear of a little Child that died? And if other Children die, why may not you be sick and die? And what will you do then, Child, if you should have no Grace in your Heart, and be found like other naughty Children?
> How do you know but that you may be the next Child that may die? And where are you then if you be not God's Child....Are you willing to go to Hell and be burn'd with the devil and his angels? Would you be in the

> same Condition as naughty Children? O Hell is a terrible place, that's worse a thousand times than whipping; God's Anger is worse than your Father's Anger; and are you willing to anger God? O Child, this is most certainly true, that all that be wicked, and die so, must be turned into Hell; and if any be once there, there is no coming out again.

[43] Although the book was not published until 1907, it describes most poignantly the experiences of a boy growing up in the middle years of the nineteenth century.

[44] See note 41.

[45] Sherwood, Fairchild Family, pp. 268 - 269.

[46] Ibid., pp. 270 - 271.

[47] Ibid., p. 278.

[48] Ibid., p. 285.

[49] Christina's method is best illustrated in one of the better known incidents in the book, "the sofa conversation." In this episode she is determined to get to the bottom of a suspected illicit relationship between her tender and naive son and the servant girl Ellen. The perfect place for such an intimate discussion was the sofa because it was "particularly well adapted for a strategic purpose." See note 90.

[50] Mamma's Stories read by herself to her little girl (London: Darton, Harvey and Darton, 1814), pp. 18 - 19.

[51] Eliza White, Gertrude; or, thoughtlessness and inattention corrected. A Tale (London: Harvey and Darton, 1823), pp. 140 - 141.

[52] "Charlotte", Mamma's Stories, pp. 19 - 20.

[53] Mary Hughes, A Mother's Care Rewarded; in the correction of those defects, most general in young people, during their education (London: William Darton, 1824), pp. 82 - 83, 85 - 86.

[54] Sherwood, Susannah, p. 98

[55] Sherwood, Henry Milner, pp. 21 - 22.

[56] Maria Budden, Right and Wrong. Exhibited in the history of Rosa and Agnes (London: J. Harris, 1815), p. 68.

[57] Lucy Lyttelton Cameron, The Two Mothers; or, memoirs of the last century (London: F. Houlston and Son, 1824), p. 62.

[58] Mary Martha Sherwood, Soffrona and her Cat Muff (London: F. Houlston and Son, 1828), p. 18.

[59] Benson, Education at Home, pp. v - vi.

[60] A note in the catalogue of the Osborne Collection states that Mrs. E. M. Field, an early historian of children's literature, considers this book to be "one of the first books of a purely modern literature in our country that...attempts to show us children as they are" (vol. II, p. 953). These fictional children are indeed very realistic, appealing and even "delightful." One might add that the relationship between these children and their parents seems to be characterized by considerably more warmth than most.

[61] Ann Fraser Tytler, Mary and Florence; or, grave and gay, third edition (London: J. Hatchard and Son, 1837), pp. 94 - 95.

[62] Sherwood, Fairchild Family, p. 56.

[63] Ibid., p. 270.

[64] deMause, "The Evolution of Childhood," p. 1.

[65] Stone, op. cit., pp. 669 - 671.

[66] Hughes, A Mother's Care Rewarded, pp. 82 - 83.

[67] Dorothy Kilner, The Holiday Present; containing anecdotes of Mr. and Mrs. Jennet and their little family...Interspersed with instructive and amusing stories and observations (London: John Harris; Baldwin, and Cradock, 1831), pp. 5 - 6. First published ca. 1780.

[68] Ibid., p. 2.

[69] "Fanny," Mamma's Stories, pp. 37 - 38.

[70] A Week At Christmas (Wellington, Salop: F. Houlston and Son, 1829), p. 85.

[71] Harriet Ventum, The Good Aunt (London: C. Chapple, 1813), pp. 78 - 79.

[72] Benson, Education at Home, pp. 85 - 86

[73] Ibid., p. 88.

[74] Ibid., pp. 88 - 89.

[75] Sherwood, Fairchild Family, p. 55.

[76] Ibid., p. 57

[77] Kilner, The Holiday Present, pp. 69 - 71.

[78] Ibid., pp. 71 - 73.

[79] Ibid., pp. 76 - 77.

[80] Ibid., pp. 76 - 68

[81] Ibid., pp. 82 - 83.

[82] Ibid., p. 86.

[83] Ibid., p. 89

[84] Ibid., pp. 89 - 91.

[85] "Mary," Mamma's Stories, pp. 26 - 27.

[86] Ibid., p. 27.

[87] Ibid., pp. 27 - 28.

[88] Ibid., p. 29.

[89] "Charlotte," Mamma's Stories, pp. 20 - 21.

[90] The sofa conversation initiated by Christina Pontifex in The Way of All Flesh could be considered an example of intrusive behavior. Christina, convinced that her son was guilty of a serious moral transgression was determined to ferret out all the details by means of tears, hysterics, or any other tactic necessary. She was determined to force herself into his innermost being, his conscience, his heart and soul:

> In spite of all his endeavours to look cheerful, even his mother could see that something was preying upon his mind. Then the idea returned to her that, after all, her son might not be innocent in the Ellen matter--and this was so interesting that she felt bound to get as near the truth as she could.
>
> "Come here, my poor, pale-faced, heavy-eyed boy," she said to him one day in her kindest manner; "come and sit down by me, and we will have a quiet confidential talk together, will we not?"
>
> The boy went mechanically to the sofa. Whenever his mother wanted what she called a confidential talk with him she always selected the sofa as the most suitable ground on which to open her campaign. All mothers do this; the sofa is to them what the dining-room is to fathers. In the present case the sofa was particularly well adapted for a strategic purpose, being an old-fashioned one with a high back, mattress, bolsters and cushions. Once safely penned into one of its deep corners it was like a dentist's chair, not too easy to get out of again. Here she could get at him better to pull

> him about, if this should seem desirable, or if she thought fit to cry she could bury her head in the sofa cushion and abandon herself to an agony of grief which seldom failed of its effect. None of her favourite manoeuvres were so easily adopted in her usual seat, the armchair on the right-hand side of the fireplace, and so well did her son know from his mother's tone that this was going to be a sofa conversation that he took his place like a lamb as soon as she began to speak and before she could reach the sofa herself.
> "My dearest boy," began his mother, taking hold of his hand and placing it within her own, "promise me never to be afraid either of your dear papa or of me; promise me this, my dear, as you love me, promise it to me." And she kissed him again and again and stroked his hair. But with her other hand she still kept hold of his; she had got him and she meant to keep him.
> The lad hung down his head and promised. What could he do? (pp. 197 - 198).

Butler writes with humour, but humour that is tinged with rancour. He had had personal experience with sofa conversations.

Edmund Gosse was another victim of parental intrusiveness. His father's constant intrusion into Edmund's inner self robbed Edmund of self-confidence. Throughout his childhood and adolescence, Edmund was timid, awkward, and tense. His physical health as well as his mental health was affected. The intrusion ended only when Edmund forcefully, desperately broke away from his father and, to use Edmund's own words, "took a human being's privilege to fashion his inner life for himself." (Father and Son, p. 223)

[91] Stone, op. cit., p. 669.

[92] Few individuals who could read and write did not keep a diary. Queen Victoria herself faithfully recorded the daily events of her life from 1832 until her death in 1901. Ultimately her diary filled more than one hundred and twenty-two volumes (Cecil Woodham-Smith, Queen Victoria: Her Life and Times, London: H. Hamilton, 1972, p. 87.)

As noted here, diaries were especially popular in religious families. Paul Sangster, the author of Pity My Simplicity, a study of Evangelicalism, comments that the diaries of Evangelicals are "strange ones":

> They form a pattern peculiar to their own kind--introverted, deeply religious, often tortured, occasionally estatic, tending to cliche. All, in spite of being introverted, are somehow self-consciously so, as if the author suspected that men--or God--would take them down and use them in evidence against them (Paul Sangster, Pity My Simplicity. The Evangelical Revival and the Religious Education of Children 1738 - 1800, London: Epworth Press, 1963, p. 69).

David Riesman also discusses the practice of diary-keeping and its relation to methods of child-rearing in his chapter, "From Morality to Morale" in The Lonely Crowd (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1980), p. 44. He associates this practice with strict parenting and the development of the "inner directed" individual.

[93] Sherwood, Fairchild Family, p. 84.

[94] Ibid., pp. 87 - 88.

[95] Ibid., p. 90.

[96] Ibid.

[97] Edmund Gosse is an excellent case in point.

[98] Sherwood, Fairchild Family, p. 119.

[99] Lucy Lyttelton Cameron, The Sister's Friend; or, Christmas Holidays spent at Home (London: L. B., Seeley and Sons, 1831), p. 111.

[100] Barbara Hofland, The Blind Farmer and His Children, second edition (London: Harris and Son, 1819), p. 72.

[101] "Mary," Mamma's Stories, p. 29.

[102] Ibid., pp. 29 - 30.

[103] Ibid., pp. 30 - 31.

[104] Charlotte was never very far from home, nor absent for very long.

[105] "Charlotte," Mamma's Stories, p. 19.

[106] Ibid., p. 21.

[107] Sherwood, Fairchild Family, p. 2.

[108] Ibid., pp. 86 - 87.

[109] Mary Martha Sherwood, The Little Woodman and his Dog Caesar, twelfth edition (London: F. Houlston and Son, 1828), pp. 9 - 10.

[110] Sherwood, Susannah, pp. 77 - 78.

[111] Isaac Watts, Divine Songs Attempted in Easy Language for the Use of Children, facsimile reproductions of the first edition of 1715 and an illustrated edition of circa 1840, with an introduction and bibliography by J. H. P. Pafford (London: Oxford University Press, 1971). In their complete form the songs appear as follows (1840 ed.):

Song XVI
Against Quarrelling and Fighting

Let dogs delight to bark and bite,
For God hath made them so;
Let bears and lions growl and fight,
For 'tis their nature too.

But, children, you should never let
Such angry passions rise;
You /sic/ little hands were never made
To tear each other's eyes.

Let love through all your actions run,
And all your words be mild;
Live like the blessed Virgin's Son,
That sweet and lovely child.

His soul was gentle as a lamb;
And as his stature grew,
He grew in favour both with man,
And God his Father too.

Now Lord of all he reigns above,
And from his heavenly throne,
He sees what children dwell in love,
And marks them for his own.

(pp. 232 - 233)

Song XVII
Love Between Brothers and Sisters

Whatever brawls disturb the street,
There should be peace at home:
Where sisters dwell and brothers meet,
Quarrels should never come.

Birds in their little nests agree;
And 'tis a shameful sight,
When children of one family,
Fall out, and chide, and fight.

Hard names at first, and threatening words,
That are but noisy breath,
May grow to clubs and naked swords,
To murder and to death.

The devil tempts one mother's son
To rail against another,
So wicked Cain was hurried on
Till he had kill'd his brother.

The wise will make their anger cool,
At least before 'tis night;
But in the bosom of a fool
It burns till morning light.

Pardon, O Lord, our childish rage,
Our little brawls remove;
That as we grow to riper age,
Our hearts may all be love.

(pp. 234 - 235)

[112] Sherwood, *Fairchild Family*, pp. 54 - 55.

[113] Ibid., p. 55.

[114] Mary Elliot, *The Little Wranglers* (London: William Darton [ca. 1825]), pp. 35 - 36.

[115] Ibid., p. 24.

[116] Lucy Lyttelton Cameron, *The History of Little Frank and his Sister*, fifth edition (London: Houlston and Son, 1837), p. 22.

[117] S.W., *The Warren Family; or, scenes at home* (London: James and Bain, 1813, 1814), pp. 28 - 31.

[118] Budden, *Always Happy!!!*, p. 3, pp. 40 - 41.

[119] Ibid., p. 47.

[120] Ibid., p. 57.

[121] Ibid., p. 58.

[122] Gordon Rattray Taylor, *The Angel Makers. A Study in the Psychological Origins of Historical Change 1750 - 1850* (New York: E. P. Dutton, 1974). Taylor's line of argument differs from Stone's. It is worth noting Taylor's argument here because it suggests that Stone's interpretation may be too simple. Taylor writes:

> Far from being immoral, this [the eighteenth century] was a period of intense religious preoccupation.... There had been a continuous Puritan tradition throughout the eighteenth century. The most active inheritors of this tradition were often extremely severe, extremely pious. There was no reason to suppose that the tradition was losing force. They were to be found, for the most part, in the trading middle classes. Thus it seemed to me that possibly the main problem with which I was faced should not be formulated, as, how did the pendulum swing from licence to prudery, but how did the trading middle class succeed in imposing its view on the rest of society (p. 43).

[123] Stone, op. cit., p. 666.

[124] Ibid., p. 667.

[125] Ann Taylor, The Family Mansion, pp. 205 - 206.

[126] Charlotte Brontë even emphasized her husband's gentleness rather than his domineering ways. In her last illness she wrote to a girlhood friend:

> I want to give you an assurance, which I know will comfort you--and that is, that I find my husband the tenderest nurse, the kindest support, the best earthly comfort that ever woman had. His patience never fails, and it is tried by sad days and broken nights...(Elizabeth Gaskell, The Life of Charlotte Brontë, Penguin Books, 1973, p. 523. The biography was originally published in 1857).

To another friend Charlotte avowed:

> No tender, better husband than mine, it seems to me, there can be in the world. I do not want now for kind companionship in health and the tenderest nursing in sickness (Gaskell, p. 524).

Her husband's devotion never faltered even as she sank deeper and deeper. Mrs. Gaskell, Charlotte's friend as well as her biographer, described the end:

> Waking for an instant from this stupor of intelligence, she saw her husband's woe worn face, and caught the sound of some murmured words of prayer that God would spare her. "Oh!" she whispered forth, "I am not going to die, am I? He will not separate us, we have been so happy" (Gaskell, p. 524).

Charlotte Brontë's firm and domineering husband proved gentle and kind. Gentleness and kindness were not thought to be incompatible with the sterner characteristics required of the paterfamilias.

[127] Quoted above p. 114. (Budden, Always Happy!!! pp. 111 - 112).

[128] Their own sons confirm this. In his Autobiography (1873) John Stuart Mill stated of his father:

> The element which was chiefly deficient in his moral relation to his children was that of tenderness. I do not believe that this deficiency lay in his own nature. I believe him to have had much more feeling than he habitually shewed, and much greater capacities of feeling than were ever developed. He resembled most Englishmen in being ashamed of the signs of feeling, and by the absence of demonstration, starving the feelings themselves. If we consider further that he was in the trying position of sole teacher, and add to this that his temper was constitutionally irritable, it is impossible not to feel pity for a father who did, and strove to do so much for his children, who would have so valued their affection, yet who must have been constantly

> feeling that fear of him was drying it up at its source. This was no longer the case, later in life and with his younger children. They loved him tenderly: and if I cannot say so much myself, I was always totally devoted to him (John Stuart Mill, Autobiography and other Writings. New York: Houghton Mifflin, 1968, p. 32).

There are similar passages in Father and Son (1907), some deeply touching in their warmth. Describing the painful period immediately following his mother's death, Edmund Gosse wrote:

> [My father] was conscious of his dull and solitary condition, and he saw, too, that it enveloped me. I think his heart was, at this time, drawn out towards me in an immense tenderness. Sometimes, when the early twilight descended upon us in the study, and he could no longer peer with advantage into the depths of his microscope, he would beckon me to him silently, and fold me closely in his arms. I used to turn my face up to his, patiently and wonderingly, while the large unwilling tears gathered in the corners of his eyelids. My training had given me a preternatural faculty of stillness, and we would stay so, without a word or a movement, until the darkness filled the room. And then, with my little hand in his, we would walk sedately downstairs, to the parlour, where we would find that the lamp was lighted, and that our melancholy vigil was ended...
> On summer evenings I used to draw my Father out, taking the initiative myself, stamping in playful impatience at his irresolution, fetching his hat and stick, and waiting. We used to sally forth at last together, hand in hand, descending in the Caledonian Road with all its shops, as far as Mother Shipton, or else winding among the semi-genteel squares and terraces westward by Copenhagen Street, or best of all, mounting to the Regent's Canal, where we paused to lean over the bridge and watch the flotillas of ducks steer under us, or little white dogs dash, impotently furious, from stem to stern of the great, lazy barges painted in a crude vehemence of vermillion and azure. These were happy hours when my Father forgot the Apocalypse and dropped his austere phraseology, and when our bass and treble voices used to ring out together over some foolish little jest or some mirthful recollection of his past experiences. Little soft oases these, in the hard desert of our sandy spiritual life at home (Edmund Gosse, Father and Son, Penguin Books, 1973, pp. 61 - 63).

[129] Stone, op. cit., p. 669.

[130] Susanna Wesley quoted in Philip J. Greven ed., Child-Rearing Concepts, 1628 - 1861 (Itasca, Ill.: F. E. Peacock, 1973), p. 47.

[131] John Wesley, "Sermon on the Education of Children," quoted in Greven, op. cit., p. 101.

[132] Crispus (Anonymous), "On the Education of Children," quoted in Greven, op. cit., p. 101.

[133] A recently published article by D. F. Tennant entitled "Anabaptist Theologies of Childhood and Education," The Baptist Quarterly vol. xxix nos. 7 and 8, July and October 1982, pp. 293 - 307, 356 - 573, indicates that the doctrine of childhood depravity was not as widely held in the past as is commonly thought. Anabaptist writings contemporary with James Janeway's A Token For Children demonstrate a more optimistic view of man than the writings of other reformist groups. Childhood was seen by the Anabaptists as a state of innocence which ended only at the point of "'knowledge of good and evil', which is the beginning of the movement into adulthood" (p. 358). Tennant quotes a number of Anabaptist authorities:

> For while they (children) are of course descendants of a sinful Adam, yet original sin as man calls it, is not reckoned to their account for the sake of Christ. For they are in this respect even as Adam and Eve were before the Fall, in that they are innocent of either right or wrong and understand neither good nor evil (p. 358).

Anabaptists also argued, on the basis of Scriptures that children were commended as "models of greatness in the Kingdom (Matt. 3.4; 19.14)" (p. 360), and as one authority wrote:

> Since therefore Christ sets the children before us as an example we should become like children and humble ourselves, it follows without contradiction: First, that children (so long as they are in their simplicity) are innocent and reckoned by God as without sin. Second, that there is also something good in children (although they have become partakers of the transgression and sinful nature of Adam) namely, the simple and unassuming nature in which they are pleasing to God (yet purely by grace through Jesus Christ) so long as they remain therein; for which reason also Christ sets children before us as an example that we should in these respects become like them (p. 360).

Because of their belief in childhood innocence, Anabaptists did not fear for the souls of infants who died: "infants who die in their infancy are in the promise of Christ and are not held guilty of sin for in their innocency sin has no effect" (p. 361).

Tennant's article also indicates that John Calvin's view of childhood should be re-examined. The great theologians's view of childhood was not as harsh as many have stated or implied. According to Tennant, Calvin had a "lofty view of childhood":

> each child has a unique personality and has a complete personality for his age; such infants are renewed by

> the Spirit of God according to their capacity, until the power in them, though latent in infancy, grows by degrees and the presumptive repentence and faith anticipated in baptism, are manifest at the proper time. The child is a "presumptive Christian" (p. 368).

And according to the Calvinist doctrine of election, "the child who dies in infancy might well have been called by God, in divine election, to serve in the invisible church"(p. 369).

Tennant's work is important for the concept of childhood depravity seems not to have been seriously questioned heretofore. In the light of Tennant's research, interpretations such as that of Lawrence Stone do appear uncomfortably simple, even more simple than already suggested here. See also "Anabaptist Protesters and Their Children," Tennant's lecture delivered to the Robert Raikes Historical Society, October, 1981, which includes an interesting section on "Anabaptist Upbringing of Children." Dr. Patricia T. Rooke kindly brought Tennant's important work to my attention.

[134] Stone, op. cit., p. 671.

[135] M. Nancy Cutt, Mrs. Sherwood and Her Books for Children (London: Oxford University Press, 1974), pp. 57 - 58. Concerning this particular little book, Soffrona and Her Cat Muff (1828), Cutt writes:

> Soffrona and Her Cat Muff...exists in a different world from Mrs. Sherwood's earlier books and publications moving between a happy home guided by a loving mother, and a little cottage with a kind old woman and a cat on the hearth. The wood that must be crossed is a delightful place where children can find: '...snail-shells, and painting-stones, and wild strawberries, and walnuts, and hazelnuts, and beautiful moss, and many kinds of flowers; and there they heard birds sing--cuckoos, and linnets and blackbirds, and thrushes; and saw beautiful butterflies with gold and purple plumes, and dragon flies, whose wings look like fine silk net'. It is not quite free of harm; for the cruel, mischevious boys come to the brook to drown the stolen kitten, which is rescued by the little girls, Soffrona and Sophia. Each small episode is delicately picked out in detail: the little walks through the wood; the packing of the basket for old Martha--and the other basket with the kitten that wilful Soffrona will not leave behind. And this wilfulness is justified--it brings about the happy ending in which the kitten is returned to its mother. Mrs. Sherwood would not have permitted this to happen in her tales of 1818; but she is indulgent to Soffrona, and the assumption seems to be that the little girl will grow out of her spoiled ways (p. 57).

[136] Sherwood, Fairchild Family, pp. 1 - 2.

[137] Stone, op. cit., p. 671.

[138] Few individuals seriously doubted the existence of God until the latter half of the nineteenth century. True atheism was rare in the pre-Victorian period.

[139] Susanna Wesley quoted in Greven, op. cit., pp. 48 - 49.

[140] Lloyd deMause, "The Evolution of Childhood" in The History of Childhood edited by Lloyd deMause (New York: Harper and Row, 1975), p. 52. DeMause's theories of projection and reversal were outlined in the Introduction of this thesis.

[141] Butler, The Way of All Flesh, pp. 197 - 198. See note 90 for full quote.

[142] Gosse, Father and Son, p. 223. Some of Gosse's experience is worth noting to give a sense of what intrusion meant to many nineteenth century children. In the epilogue of Father and Son Gosse wrote:

> With the advance of years, the characteristics of this figure became more severely outlined, more rigourously confined within settled limits. In relation to the Son --who presently departed, at a very immature age, for the new life in London--the attitude of the Father continued to be one of extreme solicitude, deepening by degrees into disappointment and disenchantment. He abated no jot or tittle of his demands upon human frailty. He kept the spiritual cord drawn tight; the Biblical bearing-rein was incessently busy, jerking into position the head of the dejected neophyte. That young soul, removed from the Father's personal inspection, began to blossom forth crudely and irregularly enough, into new provinces of thought, through fresh layers of experience. To the painful mentor at home in the West, the center of anxiety was still the meek and docile heart, dedicated to the Lord's service, which must, at all hazards and with all defiance of the rules of life, be kept unspotted from the world (p. 208).

Gosse described the painfulness of a "postal inquisition" to a young man trying to establish himself as an independent human being:

> The torment of a postal inquisition began directly as I was settled in my London lodgings. To my Father--with his ample leisure, his palpitating apprehension, his ready pen--the flow of correspondence offered no trouble at all; it was a grave but gratifying occupation. To me the almost daily letter of exhortation, with its string of questions about conduct, its series of warnings grew to be a burden which could hardly be borne, particularly because it involved a reply as punctual and if possible as full as itself. At the age of seventeen, the metaphysics of the soul are shadowy, and it is a dreadful thing to be forced to define the exact

> outline of what is so undulating and so shapeless. To my Father there seemed no reason why I should hesitate to give answers of full metallic ring to his hard and oft-repeated questions; but to me this correspondence was torture. When I feebly expostulated, when I begged to be left a little to myself, these appeals of mine automatically stimulated, and indeed blew up into fierce flames, the ardour of my Father's alarm. The letter, the only too-confidently expected letter, would lie on the table as I descended to breakfast. It would commonly be, of course, my only letter....The solitary letter, in its threatening whiteness, with its exquisitely penned address--there it would lie awaiting me destroying the taste of the bacon, reducing the flavour of the tea to insipidity. I might fatuously dally with it, I might pretend not to observe it, but there it lay. Before the morning's exercise began, I knew that it had to be read, and what was worse, that it had to be answered. Useless the effort to conceal from myself what it contained. Like all its precursors, like all its followers, it would insist, with every variety of appeal, on a reiterated declaration that I still fully intended, as in the earliest days of childhood, "to be on the Lord's side in everything." (p. 208 - 209)

Gosse provided an example of one of his father's letters. Prying, insistant, demanding in tone, it is little wonder such letters caused the young man so much distress:

> Let me say that the "solemnity" you complain of [in your letters] has only been the expression of tender anxiousness of a father's heart, that his only child, just turned out upon the world, and very far out of his sight and hearing, should be walking in God's way. Recollect that it is now not as it was when you were at school, when we had personal communication with you at intervals of five days:--we now know absolutely nothing of you, save from your letters, and if they do not indicate your spiritual prosperity, the deepest solicitudes of our hearts have nothing to feed on. But I will try henceforth to trust you, and lay aside my fears; for you are worthy of my confidence; and your own God and your father's God will hold you with His right hand. (p. 210)

"He would 'try henceforth to trust me', he said," the younger Gosse commented. "Alas! the effort would be in vain...."

[143] The Evangelical revival affected all aspects of English society and its influence was felt for the greater part of the century. As G. M. Young writes in A Portrait of an Age:

> Evangelicalism had imposed on society, even on classes which were indifferent to its religious basis and unaffected by its economic appeal, its code of Sabbath observance, responsibility, and philanthropy; of discipline in the home and regularity in affairs; and had created a most effective technique of agitation, of

private persuasion and social persecution (G. M. Young, A Portrait of an Age. Victorian England, second edition, London: Oxford University Press, 1977, p. 4).

[144] Although much of Kern's article pertains to the middle and latter half of the nineteenth century, some consideration of its contents is justified since ideas, attitudes, theories, and behaviors usually develop gradually, particularly in the area of human relationships. Moreover, many of those individuals he discusses in his article would have been children in the pre-Victorian period, and their attitudes toward their families, their children would have been formed in part by their childhood experiences.

[145] Kern, op. cit., p. 439.

[146] Kern continues:

> The most widely discussed aspect of heredity was degeneration--the transmission of destructive properties to the offspring. The lack of an accurate account of sexual reproduction led to the theory that acquired germs and vices remained forever locked into the germinal cells of the individual and accumulated from one generation to the next....Germs and vices as well as "internal secretions" were believed to be at work in the family, undermining health and morality in inscrutable ways. The French educator Compayre, argued that morbid phenomena are especially subject to the laws of heredity, and accordingly "the bad is transmitted more easily than the good." The biological unity of family life reaches over the generations to carry the curse of ancestral sin and "unrestrained acts." There has been some time--a day, an hour--in which the fate of an entire family has been cast, so that a mutual moral responsiblity binds parents to children (p. 441).

[147] Ruskin had a passion for collecting paintings by the artist Turner. He was one of the first critics to recognize Turner's talent.

[148] Ruskin quoted in Abse, op. cit., p. 192.

CHAPTER IV

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE FAMILY, THE HOUSEHOLD, AND THE COMMUNITY

CHAPTER IV

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE FAMILY, THE HOUSEHOLD, AND THE COMMUNITY

I. Introduction

In his conclusion to Centuries of Childhood Philippe Ariès emphasizes his belief in the communality and sociability of life in the past by discussing the scarcity of "interior and family scenes" in "iconographic documents" before the sixteenth century:

> /The historian/ has to hunt for them with a magnifying glass and interpret them with the aid of hypotheses. On the other hand he promptly makes the acquaintance of the principal character in this iconography, a character as essential as the chorus in the classical theatre: the crowd--not the massive, anonymous crowd of our overpopulated cities, but the assembly of neighbours, women and children, numerous but not unknown to one another....It is as if everyone had come out instead of staying at home: there are scenes depicting streets and markets, games and crafts, soldiers and courtiers, churches and tortures. In the street, in the fields, outside, in public, in the midst of a collective society--that is where the artist chooses to set the events or the people he wishes to depict.[1]

The iconographers, Ariès argues, were presenting a "profound reality." Life in the past was lived in public. Society, not family life, was ascendant.

One of his most convincing examples of this ascendancy of society, and one examined earlier in this thesis, is his description of the upper class house in the past. The very structure of the house precluded privacy. Rooms opened one onto another and were multipurpose. No room had a special function except perhaps the kitchen. The head of the house conducted his business in the same rooms he shared with his family. Upper class houses were indeed public places. In some of the largest houses, a steady stream of clients, dependants, visitors, relatives, and servants came, went and stayed. In many cases, the house fulfilled the function of a cafe or public house in later days. "Everyday relations never left a man by himself," Ariès writes.

> This sociability had for a long time indeed hindered the formation of the concept of the family because of the lack of privacy....The density of society left no room for the family. Not that the family did not exist as a reality: it would be paradoxical to deny that it did. But it did not exist as a concept.[2]

The family as a concept did exist by the eighteenth century among the well-to-do classes. It spread to the other classes, and, to use Ariès's words, "imposed itself tyrannically on people's consciousnesses."[3] As noted previously, Ariès does not consider the development of the family to be a wholly positive thing.

> The evolution of the last few centuries has often been presented as the triumph of individualism over social constraints, with the family counted among the latter. But where is the individualism in these modern lives, in which all the energy of the couples is directed to serving the interests of a deliberately restricted posterity? Was there not greater individualism in the gay indifference of the prolific fathers of the ancien regime?....Starting in the eighteenth century, people began defending themselves against a society whose constant intercourse had hitherto been the source of education, reputation and wealth.../and/ private life /has been/ reinforced at the expense of neighbourly relationships, friendships, and traditional contacts ....One is tempted to conclude that sociability and the concept of the family were incompatible, and could only develop at each other's expense.[4]

Historians following Ariès have taken up his concern with the relationship between sociability and the development of the concept of the family. Stone devotes a chapter to the subject in The Family, Sex and Marriage in England 1500 - 1800.[5] Although he does at one point note that the decline of family and community interaction "may not have been altogether for the good,"[6] and he does, like Ariès, deplore the intense emotional bonding that characterized parent-child relationships in the nineteenth century, he feels far less nostalgia for the past:

> It is certainly true that the nuclear family's kin affiliations and its openness to community pressures have been undermined, that many of its economic and social functions have been taken over by larger and more impersonal institutions...and that the trend towards atomistic individualism has increased. But everything we know about the pre-modern community, such as the village, indicates that it was riddled with competitive feuds and factions, usually organized around kinship groups.[7]

The lament for the community of the past reappears in Edward Shorter's book, The Making of the Modern Family. Shorter picks up Ariès's argument as follows:

> The physical matrix within which the traditional family found itself discouraged intimacy. Too many curious faces thrust themselves into *la vie intime*; too many heterogeneous elements swirled through the household. The community's informal surveillance was omnipresent, thanks to the arrangement of space, and the formal restrictions that the social authorities placed on sentiment and inclination were too powerful to let close emotional ties arise. The evolution of the modern couple would require a dissolution of this intense collective life....Domesticity, or the family's awareness of itself as a precious emotional unit that must be protected with privacy and isolation from outside intrusion, was a spearhead of the great onrush of sentiment in modern times. Romantic love detached the couple from communal sexual supervision and turned

> them towards affection. Maternal love created a sentimental nest within which the modern family would ensconce itself, and it removed many women from involvement with community life. Domesticity, beyond that, sealed off the family as a whole from its traditional interaction with the surrounding world.[8]

According to Shorter, this "sealing off" has had definite negative effects. It has put the family in "physical and spiritual isolation" and resulted in "the abandonment of a meaningful emotional life outside the home." In addition, "another price is a vastly increased instability in marital relations. A final price...is the disintegration of a sense of the lineage of the family. Nothing is free in this world."[9]

The general consensus seems to be that the development of the modern family required the pushing away of the community and the intensification of emotional relationships. So many historians of the family refer to the family as isolated. There is a sense of regret in their presentations of the preindustrial family. It is a nostalgia that may in fact derive from contemporaries themselves who, it was noted in the last chapter, idealized the past as they faced the confusion, instability, and insecurity of the industrial age. But how isolated in fact was the family from the community? This is the question that will be the focus of this chapter. The previous chapter examined internal relationships and considered whether the family was a refuge, a place of peace, or a "prison of love," a "stifling fortress of emotional bonding." This chapter will address external relationships and consider the relationships between the family, the household, and the community. Does the evidence presented in didactic children's literature support the theory that families were sealed off from the community, suffering in physical and spiritual isolation?

The relationship between the family, the household and the community will be examined under three main topics: the economic relationship, the social and cultural relationship, and the religious relationship.

II. The Economic Relationship

1. The Location and Occupation of the Family Residence

A discussion of the relationship between the family, the household, and the community must begin with an examination of the physical relationship of the household to the community. Families living in or near a community have more opportunities for interaction with members of the community than those living at a great distance. In the literature, households were located in the community, close to the community, or isolated from the community. The community was defined as a town or village, or even a cluster of dwellings belonging to several families. A household was considered close to the community if it appeared to be within reasonable walking or riding distance from the community. A household was considered isolated if journeying to the nearest community seemed to require considerable time and effort. In cases where the residence changed during the course of the story, the location of the residence was considered to be the place where most of the action or the most important part of the action in the story took place. What Trade Shall I Be?

presented an unusual problem however. The story began in London but most of the action took place on a ship sailing to Canada. Since the family lived in London and in the community of immigrants on the ship, the location of the family's residence was considered to be "in the community."

It was not usually difficult to determine whether or not a family was isolated. The author generally suggested isolation through direct statement or descriptive detail in the opening paragraphs of the story. For example, in *The Little Woodman and His Dog Caesar*, Mrs. Sherwood wrote:

> In former times there lived, on the borders of a very wide forest, a certain wood-cutter, named Roger Hardfoot, who had seven sons....He was an industrious man, and gained a very good livelihood by cutting wood in the forest, and tying it up in faggots. These he conveyed, on the backs of asses, to a small town at some distance; and with the money which he sold them for, he brought back such things as he had need of for himself and his family.[10]

Further details in the story emphasized the isolation of the household. The forest by the hut was dark and looming and filled with fierce wolves. The nearest neighbour appeared to be the woodcutter's mother who lived in the forest "three or four long days' journey from this place."[11] Only seven households were considered isolated. The majority of households appeared to be located in or close to the community.

It was sometimes difficult to determine whether or not a family actually lived in the community or just near by. Here descriptive details such as the proximity of the home to shops, public buildings, the use of "street" as opposed to "road" or "path" indicated residence in the community. Descriptions of family activities also provided suggestions.

In The History of Little Lucy, details of a shopping expedition placed the location of the household firmly in the community. Lucy and her mother set out from home one day to buy a doll for the little girl's birthday. Although the doll in the end was not purchased because Lucy preferred to give her birthday money to a poor girl, the number and description of the shops, the streets, and above all the proximity of their home to all of this, indicated that they did live in the community.

The Fairchild family on the other hand, lived not in but close to the community. In the first paragraph of the book, Mrs. Sherwood stated that "Mr. and Mrs. Fairchild lived very far from any town." Their house "stood in the midst of a garden, which in the summer time was full of fruit and sweet flowers." The family kept a pig and a cow which grazed in Mr. Fairchild's meadow.[12] Even though the family "lived very far from any town," they did in fact live near a community, a village, for as Mrs. Sherwood continued in her introduction to The History of the Fairchild Family:

> I must not forget to say, that Mr. Fairchild had a school for poor boys in the next village, and Mrs. Fairchild one for girls. I do not mean that they taught the children entirely themselves, but they paid a master and mistress to teach them; and they used to take a walk, two or three times a week, to see the children, and to give rewards to those who had behaved well. When Lucy, and Emily, and Henry were obedient, their papa and mamma were so kind as to let them go with them to see the schools; and then they always contrived to have some little thing ready to carry with them, as presents to the good children.[13]

Had the household not been quite close to the community, Mr. and Mrs. Fairchild, and especially the three small children, could not have walked to the village school carrying presents two or three times a week. Another indication that the household was close to a community rather than isolated occurred later in the book. Mr. Fairchild was able to get up early one morning to go down to the village and return home in time for breakfast.[14]

Mrs. Trimmer's description in Fabulous Histories of the "elegant mansion" with its surrounding courtyard and orchard owned by the Benson family suggested that this residence was not located in the community. The household was not isolated, however, for Mrs. Benson and her children both visited and received guests from the neighborhood. The Benson residence therefore was considered close to the community.

The majority of households, a total of 75, were in fact considered close to the community. Twenty-nine households were considered to be located in the community, and 7 were isolated. The location of the household could not be determined in eight situations.

Closely related to the subject of the location of the family residence was that of its actual occupation. Whether or not the residence was occupied all year or only seasonally would have an affect on the kind of relationship possible between the particular household and the community. Most of the families in the literature did in fact live in their houses throughout the year. Altogether 109 families occupied their residence all year, while only 8 did so seasonally. For 2 families, the pattern of occupancy could not be determined.

These figures show that the families portrayed in the literature were not particularly mobile barring businesss trips or occasional visits to friends or relatives. These figures do reflect reality for the comfortable classes who bulk large in the literature. By and large, it was the lower classes who were on the move, moving into the towns and cities in search of employment in the new factories and mills. But even so, any kind of mobility was difficult. Roads were poor and methods of transportation were slow and inefficient in the early part of the century. These figures pertaining to the location of the residence and its occupation are consistent with the picture of early nineteenth century English society established in the second chapter of this thesis. The majority of the population lived in rural conditions even up to the middle of the century. English society in the pre-Victorian period could be described as predominantly rural and non-mobile.

2. The Location of Employment

In the literature, another factor affecting the household's relationship with the community was the location of the parents', particularly the father's, employment. The various types of employment represented in the literature have been discussed, but no reference has been made to their locations--in the household, in the community, or outside the community.

Determining the father's location of employment was not always easy. A large number of fathers appeared to have employment that was not readily definable. They appeared to have some kind of employment in the household or an independent fortune. The latter were usually wealthy noblemen or gentlemen like Lord Harewood In The Memoirs of Emma and Her Nurse or Mr. Grant in Amendment by Catherine Parr Traill and Susanna Moodie. Many of the former, like Mr. Fairchild, appeared to have no actual employment except the direct supervision of their more modest estates. One character, however, one of Susannah's uncles in Susannah by Mrs. Sherwood, worked in his home as a physician. Another father in The Fruits of Education by Mrs. Cameron remained in the household because of illness. A total of 35 fathers were employed in the household or possessed an independent income. With one exception, the retired sailor in Orphan Rachel (1820), these fathers were members of the middle or upper classes.

Twenty-seven fathers were employed in the community. Their occupations ranged from laborers, as represented in The History of Isaac Jenkins by Thomas Beddoes, to the governor of Iceland in Nina. Lower, middle, and upper classes were represented, but in significant numbers. Only 1 upper class father was employed in the community. This man, identified as a "public officer," appeared in The Good Aunt by Harriet Ventum. As would be expected, a greater number of middle and lower class fathers were employed there. These men worked as laborers, tradesmen, shopkeepers, clergymen, and teachers. Eighteen were members of the middle class, 8 were lower class.

Ten husbands and fathers worked outside the community. Two were members of the upper class, 7 were middle class, and 1 was lower class. Two of these men were members of the military who not only worked outside the community, but also outside the country in such places as India and the West Indies as in The Fruits of Education by Mrs. Cameron and The Visit by Miss Grierson. In The Daughter-in-Law, Her Father and Family by Barbara Hofland (1829), the head of the household was a merchant whose office was in London. Four heads of families were clergymen. One, a clergyman recently returned from the West Indies in Improvement by Diana Bayley, had business which took him outside the community for the greater part of the story. Another clergyman in Nina by Maria Budden served migrant shepherds and homesteaders in isolated mountain areas of Iceland.

The occupations of three husbands and fathers who worked outside the community could not be determined. Two were upper class members, one was lower class. Of the former, Mr. Benson of Mrs. Trimmer's Fabulous Histories had business which took him away from home the whole period of time covered by the story. Although it was not stated by the author, the lower class father who appeared in The Orphan Brothers by Mary Elliot (1825) may have been an agricultural laborer who had to go out of the community to find work. This seems to be a reasonable assumption since the community was an agricultural one and his two abandoned boys eventually took up the occupation themselves.

A small number of fathers appeared to work both in the household and in the community or both in the community and out of the community. The father represented in The Blind Father and His Children by Barbara Hofland worked in the neighboring village until he temporarily lost his vision and was confined to the house. In Emily and Henrietta by William Sullivan,[15] the father was a doctor who worked both in the community and outside as he was needed. Another father who appeared in The Warren Family by S. W., travelled from a suburb of London into the city where he worked as a bank clerk. To supplement his income, he also worked in his community tutoring children in their homes. A total of 8 husbands and fathers worked in more than one location. All three social classes were represented.

For another large group of fathers, 39, there was either insufficient information in the story to determine the location of employment, or the father was absent or dead. But this lack of information was significant in itself. According to the data discussed in the second chapter, only 80 fathers were actually present and living in the house.

On the whole, it is difficult to comment on the relationship between social class and location of employment. All three classes were represented in all locations. The only case in which the relationship may have been significant was in the category "in the community." It was noted that only 1 upper class household head was employed in the community. This may well reflect the fact that occupations "in the community" were those traditionally associated with the middle and lower classes--shopkeepers, tradesmen, clergymen, and laborers.

With respect to mothers and their locations of employment, by far the majority of mothers present and living in the home were employed in the household--74 out of 82 mothers. It could be said that this reflects historical reality because very few women of the upper and middle classes in this period of history worked outside the home. There were few occupations considered respectable for women.

Eight mothers in the literature worked in the community. No mothers worked outside the community. All but two of these mothers belonged to lower class families. In Peggy and Her Mammy by Mary Elliot, The Little Cowslip Gatherers by Esther Copley, The Faithful Nurse by Caroline Maxwell (1829), Motherless Mary, and The Good Mother's Legacy by Hannah More (?; 1830), the mothers were widowed or abandoned and had to support their families by working in shops, factories, or in the fields. In The Blind Farmer and His Children by Barbara Hofland, the mother was not widowed or abandoned, but she was forced to take up employment outside the home when her husband lost his vision and the family fortunes declined. In Claudine by Maria Budden, the family belonged to the middle class but following the death of the father, the family fortunes declined. The mother and the eldest daughter Claudine had to work outside the home to support the family. In Nina, another book by Maria Budden, the mother, an energetic clergyman's wife, actively helped her husband with his work in the community.

In many of these stories, the mothers were helped by resourceful, industrious little girls. In Peggy and Her Mammy, Peggy was anxious to make her Mammy's life more comfortable as the latter grew more and more feeble. The little girl began to make and sell pincushions to earn enough money to buy a new chair for Mammy to rest in after her hard day's work. When the hard-earned money had to be spent on rent for the cottage instead, their wealthier neighbors, impressed by Peggy's industry and resourcefulness, bought Mammy the new chair. In The Little Cowslip Gatherers, Nancy and her mother were able to make a living for themselves by means of frugality, industry, and honesty. Nancy was particularly resourceful. She opened an account in a savings bank which in the end enabled her to buy a respectable trousseau. In Claudine, it was the daughter who was the real source of strength, both physical and spiritual, in the family. She supported her family through a series of crises.

It was not possible to determine the mother's location of employment in 37 families. But as in the case of fathers, this figure does reflect the high mortality rate among adults noted in the second chapter. Only 82 mothers in 119 families were present and living in the home.

3. The Economic Relationship of the Household to the Community

The location of the residence, whether it was occupied all year or only seasonally, and the location of the family's employment were the factors which ultimately determined the nature of the economic relationship of the household to the community. A family that lived and worked in the community was more likely to be economically dependent on that community than otherwise. That community provided not only shelter but also employment, goods and services, and in the case of wealthier families, household help.

The History of Goody Two-Shoes (1765; 1815; 1830) provided a good example of a character who was dependent on the community for her livelihood. In this popular story which first appeared in the eighteenth century, a poor orphan girl learned to read and write with the help of more fortunate children who were able to go to school. Goody turned her learning to good account and became "a trotting Tutoress":

> every Morning she used to go round to teach the Children ....I once went her Rounds with her, and was highly diverted....It was about seven o'clock in the Morning when we set out on this important Business, and the first House we came to was Farmer *Wilson's*....Here *Margery* stopped, and ran up to the Door, *Tap*, *tap*, *tap*. Who's there? Only little goody *Two-Shoes*, answered *Margery*, come to teach *Billy*. Oh Little *Goody*, says Mrs. *Wilson*, with Pleasure in her Face, I am glad to see you, *Billy* wants you sadly, for he has learned all his Lesson. Then out came the little Boy. *How do doody Two-Shoes*, says he, not able to speak plain. Yet this little Boy had learned all his Letters....[16]

Goody Two-Shoes became an excellent schoolmistress, respected and loved by all the community.

Thirty-nine families were considered economically dependent on the community. That is, all or the greater part of their income derived from interaction with the community. Significantly, all of these families belonged to the lower or middle classes. No upper class families were represented in this group. They had independent sources of income.

Not all families that lived in the community were dependent on it for their livelihood. For example, the family presented in The Visit by Miss Grierson was only partially dependent on the community. In this book, the family had a source of income that did not derive from employment in the community. The father of this middle class family was an officer in the navy. He was absent throughout the story. His salary maintained the family, but the family may have had an additional source of income as well. At any rate, this family maintained a large house with a garden and a number of servants. The family was dependent on the community for household help, and no doubt, staples.

The majority of the families in the literature, 63, did appear to be semi-dependent on the community. Twenty-nine of these families were upper class families, 29 middle class, and 5 lower class. The Fairchild family was a middle class family typical of this group. The source of Mr. Fairchild's income was not given. Possibly he had an inheritance, but certainly he was not employed outside the community. The family was self-sufficient in some ways. According to Mrs. Sherwood, "their house stood in the midst of a garden, which in the summer time was full of fruit and sweet flowers,"[17] and Mr. Fairchild owned a cow and a pig. The garden and the meadow, the cow and the pig did not supply all the family's needs, and when the servant John asked permission to go to the Midsummer Fair, Mr. Fairchild replied, "You may go, John... and take the horse, and bring everything that is wanting."[18]

An example of a lower class family that was semi-dependent on the community appeared in The Little Woodman and His Dog Caesar, another book by Mrs. Sherwood. This family, as noted above, lived some distance from the community, and therefore had to be self-sufficient to some extent at least. The father, a woodcutter, was not actually employed in the community, but there was, nonetheless, a semi-dependent relationship between the family and the community because the father regularly journeyed to the nearest town to sell wood and to purchase things for himself and his family.[19]

Some of those families considered semi-independent may in fact have been independent of the community. Certainly, some had ties with the community that appeared very vague and tenuous indeed. One such example was presented in Anna Ross by Grace Kennedy. One of the two families presented belonged to the upper class. The source of the father's income was not disclosed. The family lived in a large urban center and seemed to have contact with others primarily through social activities such as parties and balls. In addition, their contact with those of other social classes was limited. Yet one would assume that there had to be some transactions between the household and the community, even if they were not actually recorded. The family, particularly since it was upper class, would have needed to recruit some household help from the community and to purchase some staples.

The difficulty in determining the relationship between some households and the community derives from the focus of the books themselves. A book such as Anna Ross which concentrated on the contrast between the life styles of two families, one characterized by frivolousness, carelessness, and worldliness, and the other by industry, piety, and humility, would not dwell overlong, if at all, on community relationships. The moral discussion was too important.

Because of insufficient evidence in the books and stories themselves, the economic relationship between the household and the community could not be determined in 17 out of 119 families.

III. The Social and Cultural Relationship Between the Family, the Household and the Community

1. Introduction

Philippe Ariès observes that "to realize the importance of games and festivities in the society of old is hard for us today, when for countrymen and city-dwellers alike there is only a very narrow margin between a laborious, hypertrophied professional activity and a demanding, exclusive family vacation."[20] In the Medieval and Renaissance past characterized, according to Ariès, by sociability and communality, men, women, and children participated freely in community social activities--parties, balls, festivals, games, and various amusements. This was no longer the case, he argues, by the late eighteenth and nineteenth centuries:

> In the society of old, work did not take up so much time during the day and did not have so much importance

> in the public mind: it did not have the existential value which we have given it for something like a hundred years. One can scarcely say that it had the same meaning. On the other hand, games and amusements extended far beyond the furtive moments we allow them: They formed one of the principal means employed by a society to draw its collective bonds closer, to feel united.[21]

This is another expression then, of the familiar idea of the nineteenth century family as a refuge, a "stifling fortress of emotional bonding." The family, as it jealously guarded its privacy, pushed back society, and, it is suggested, has lost more than it has gained in the process. The extent to which this argument is borne out in the data taken from children's literature will be the focus of this section.

2. Family Involvement in Community Social Activities

Community social activities were defined as parties, balls, social visiting, fairs, and exhibitions. Social activities were considered distinct from social work which involved visiting the poor and providing relief in the form of money, food, clothing, and religious tracts. Participation in social activities ranged from high involvement, which meant that the family almost always participated, to low involvement where the family seldom or never participated. Because not all members of the family were equally involved in community social activities, the participation of fathers, mothers, boys, and girls were examined separately.

In 10 families the father was highly involved in community social activities. As the small number indicates, and indeed as the contents of the stories themselves reveal, to be highly involved in community social activities was not considered desirable. With one exception, none of these fathers was presented in a very positive light. That exception was the father in Maria Budden's book, Nina. This father, because of his position as governor of Iceland, had to be highly involved in community social activities. Examples of less than admirable fathers occurred in The Fruits of Education by Mrs. Cameron, Ellen by Alicia Mant, The Good Aunt by Harriet Ventum, and The Family Mansion by Ann Taylor. All these fathers were pleasure-loving and frivolous. One father was presented in a particularly unfavorable light. In Mrs. Cameron's Sophia, the father's high degree of participation in social activities became utter dissipation. He brought on his own death as a result, and burdened his young wife and family with enormous debts. These fathers gave little attention to their families, and, as in The Family Mansion and The Good Aunt, allowed their children to be raised solely by servants and governesses. In a number of stories, for example, The Family Mansion and The Fruits of Education, the children followed the pattern of the father or father figure.

Far more fathers participated in community social activities to a moderate or low extent--33 and 32 respectively. This was clearly the preferred mode of behavior. It would be a mistake to conclude, however, that these fathers were unsociable or even recluses. Many in fact, even those whose participation was very low, were active in the community, but more or less restricted their activities to social work. Mr.

Fairchild was a good example of such a father. Social visits were kept to a minimum, and he never attended parties, dances, or balls. He did not attend the Midsummer Fair but sent his servant John in his place. Although Mr. Fairchild's participation in community social activities was considered low, his involvement in community social work was regarded as high.

It was not possible to determine the degree of participation in community social activities for 44 fathers. This figure reflected the high mortality rate among fathers in the literature.

Figures for the mothers' participation in community social activities resemble those determined for the fathers'. Seven mothers were highly involved while 38 and 34 mothers were involved to a moderate or low extent respectively. It was not possible to determine the extent of participation for 40 mothers. Again, this figure reflected the mortality rate of mothers in the literature.

Like the fathers, mothers who were highly involved in community social activities were not presented in a favorable light in the literature. They were frivolous, self-indulgent women who were inclined to neglect their children or entrust them to the care of nurses, governesses, or servants, which usually had unfortunate results. In Ann Taylor's book, The Family Mansion, for example, one daughter entrusted to the servants died as a result of neglect. A second daughter, also left to the care of servants, suffered no physical harm, but she did not profit from the experience. One female servant in particular had a bad influence on the girl. The former filled the girl's head with romantic ideas and encouraged her to elope with an unscrupulous young man who was interested only in her status and money. Needless to say, the young wife and her children were mistreated. The author provided a happy ending, but the story nonetheless was a criticism of those mothers who were too busy indulging themselves to attend properly to the rearing of their children. In The Two Mothers by Mrs. Cameron, little Mary-Anne was fortunate to escape the consequences of a careless upbringing. She and her rather worldly mother went to stay with an aunt, the mother's sister, when the mother became ill. This aunt, a pious clergyman's wife, was able to influence the attitudes and behavior of both the mother and the daughter. She instructed her worldly sister in "the joys of simple pleasures"[22] and taught her how "to walk in the house of God."[23] She also gave her sister advice on the proper way to rear and discipline the difficult Mary-Anne who displayed a degree of disobedience

> which was perhaps never seen in a child of four years old, used to submission from its cradle. But it must be remembered, that Mary-Anne had been rarely contradicted since her birth.[24]

Mary-Anne grew up to be a pious, modest young woman, and the author rewarded her with a happy marriage.

Examples of mothers who participated in community social activities to a moderate or low extent were Mrs. Fairchild and Mrs. Benson of Fabulous Histories by Mrs. Trimmer. Both restricted their social activities to a few social visits, which usually had an instructive purpose. The visit of Mrs. Benson and her daughter Harriet to a certain Mrs. Addis was just such a visit with a purpose:

> On entering the hall, the young lady [Harriet], took notice of a very disagreeable smell, and was surprised with the appearance of a parrot, a paroquet, and a macaw, all in the most elegant cages. In the next room she came to, were a squirrel and a monkey, which had each a little house neatly ornamented. On being introduced into the drawing-room, she observed in one corner a lap dog lying on a splendid cushion; and in a beautiful little cradle, which she supposed to contain a large wax doll, lay, in great state, a cat, with a litter of kittens. In vain did Miss Harriet look for Mrs. Addis's children, for neither of them appeared.[25]

Mrs. Addis, it appeared, indulged and pampered her pets to an unnatural extent and neglected human beings, including her own children. She had no thought for human misery or suffering. Mrs. Benson allowed her child to witness this foolish woman's behavior for some time, and when Mrs. Benson and Harriet were at last alone, she explained the reason for their visit:

> I know what opinion you have formed of Mrs. Addis, and should not have brought you to be a spectator of her follies, had I not hoped that an hour or two passed in her company would afford you a lesson which might be useful to you through life. I have before told you, that our affections towards the inferior parts of creation should be properly regulated; you have, in your friend Miss Jenkins and her brother, seen instances of cruelty to them, which I am sure you will never be inclined to imitate; but I was apprehensive you might fall into the contrary extreme, which is equally blameable. Mrs. Addis you see, has absolutely transferred the affection she ought to feel for her child, to creatures who would really be much happier without it.[26]

The instructive value of social visiting was also brought forward in The Factory Girl. A discussion about the frivolous behavior of one of their friends gave eighteen year old Mary an opportunity to express, at some length, her views on visiting to her friend Nancy:

"Well," said Nancy...."I am afraid...I should not be able to convince Lucy that it was better to stay at home than to go into company."

"And I hope, my dear Nancy," replied Mary, "you will not wish to convince her that staying home is always better than visiting. We are commanded to love our fellow-creatures, and general benevolence is often increased by an acquaintance with those of respectable character whom Providence has placed within our reach. On an intimacy, we commonly find in them qualities to admire, which we did not suppose they possessed, that leads us to hope strangers may have virtues which we do not see, and disposes our hearts to kindness towards them. An intercourse with society has a tendency to weaken our pride and self-complacency. We are very apt to think ourselves more virtuous than other people, till we see them conducting themselves under difficulties and trials better than we should in similar circumstances."

"There is still another advantage. We may discover in company what our prevailing desires are, if we are really as religious as we imagine ourselves to be when alone and undisturbed by temptation. We may try our faith in the omnipresence of God, by the earnestness of our endeavours to preserve purity in conversation, and sincerity in manner. We may judge of our obedience to the command of the Saviour, to 'love one another', by the unwillingness with which we hear the slander, and the readiness to vindicate, where it can be done with truth; and also by the pleasure we can take in witnessing the happiness and superior advantages of our companions. Of our humility, we may judge by the meekness with which we bear the neglect and indifference of those, whose esteem and attentions we can not but wish."

"But you seem to be contradicting now, what I have often heard you say," said Nancy; "that a few hours of mirth spent in company, would soon be passed away, and perhaps leave nothing worth remembering; but if the same time had been improved in reading a useful book, it might leave in the memory something agreeable to recollect through life."

"Don't you remember," said Mary, "that Mr. Seymore told us, last Sunday, that the duties of a Christian formed an extensive circle, and that every virtue which composed the ample round required our attention, or the circle would be broken and injured?"

"O yes," said Nancy, "now you repeat it, I remember it perfectly; though I had forgotten all but that part where he observed, that some people were apt to reduce all excellence to a certain point. I could not think what that meant, but now it seems clear."

"By confining all goodness to the single act of staying at home to read," said Mary, "we should do the same

> thing. I did not mean to condemn visiting altogether, but only that excessive fondness for company that dissipates the thoughts and leaves no time for reading. Both are good in their turn, if we are careful to keep in mind, that reading will be of no advantage unless we choose good books; and that visiting time is thrown away if we do not practice when abroad the virtues we have learned to love in retirement."
> "But yet," said Nancy, "you seem by your example, to recommend reading in preference to going out; for you are seldom from home of an evening."
> "General rules will not apply to all," replied Mary, lowering her voice; "every one must consult his peculiar situation. I should gain the advantages of society at too great a price, to leave my grandmother alone, who depends on me for much of her amusement; and needs my attention on many accounts, particularly in the evening."
> "Ah," said Nancy, with a look of affectionate approbation, "it is you who keep that same beautiful circle of Mr. Seymore's, as round and as bright as the sun."[27]

The pattern of children's participation in community social activities was not unlike that noted for adults. Very few children participated to a great extent in community social activities, and like their parents, those who did were not presented in a favorable light. Although these children just followed the examples set by one or both of their parents, the authors never excused their behavior. For the sake of simplicity, where there were a number of children in a family, only one example from each sex was chosen to represent the degree of participation in social activities.

In only 2 families were the boys highly involved in community social activities. In 32 families the boys were moderately involved, and in 35 families the boys were involved in social activities to a very low extent. The degree of participation could not be determined for 50 families.

In the case of girls, a slightly greater number, 7, were highly involved in community social activities. The girls of 45 and 37 families were involved to a moderate and low extent respectively. There was no information for 30 families.

The difference between the number of girls and boys who were highly involved in community social activities may be significant. Girls in the didactic literature did show more interest in parties, dances, and balls than boys did, but boys had more physical freedom than girls, and more opportunities for social and intellectual interaction. Far more boys than girls, for example, went away to school. Moreover, to present girls as more interested in parties and dances than boys may have had something to do with sexual stereotyping or role modeling. The male counterpart of female frivolousness was most often drinking and gambling. Girls could be frivolous about parties at an earlier age than boys could indulge in drinking and gambling.

The degree of family involvement in community social activities did appear to be affected by social class. No lower class families participated to a very great extent in community social activities. One reason for this would be that lower class families had no extra money to spend on amusements such as parties and dances, nor would they in most cases have had the suitable dress. It must be noted, however, that some lower class families did find the money to spend on spirits. Isaac Jenkins in The History of Isaac Jenkins by Thomas Beddoes, was a good case in point. Drinking, however, cannot really be considered a community social activity. Although in reality many poor families would have attended local fairs and rural dances such as those described by the novelist Thomas Hardy in the latter part of the century, none of these activities except the Midsummer Fair noted in *The History of the Fairchild Family* were mentioned in the didactic literature.

An approximate idea of the relationship between social class and family involvement in community social activities can be determined if the degree of involvement of one parent, either mother or father, is taken to represent the whole family. Five upper class families and 5 middle class families were highly involved in community social activities. No lower class families were included in this group. Eight upper class, 31 middle class, and 1 lower class families were involved to a moderate extent. Twelve upper class, 18 middle class, and 13 lower class families were involved only to a very low extent in community social activities. In short, the majority of fictional families of all classes were involved in community social activities to a moderate or low extent.

3. Family Involvement in Community Social Work

Many families that were not highly involved in community social activities were by contrast very active in community social work. Indeed, the authors were more concerned with this type of social interaction than with social activities, and consequently, provided far more details.

Social activities in the form of parties, dances, and balls were generally disapproved of and dismissed as frivolous. Social work, on the other hand, was approved of and encouraged. It consisted of providing relief for the less fortunate in the form of donations of food, clothing, money, religious tracts, and especially good advice. Visiting the poor, the sick, and establishing charity schools were also considered social work.

The emphasis on social work in didactic children's literature was a reflection of a very real concern in the nineteenth century. For all the misery and degradation which characterized the lives of so many in the Industrial Age, there was a very real concern for the condition of the poor among members of the middle and upper classes. Indeed, the nineteenth century is sometimes referred to as the Age of Philanthropy. There was a religious impetus behind this concern for the poor. As one writer has remarked, "It is not too much to say that, more than any other single factor, the Evangelical Movement in the Church of England transformed the whole character of English society and imparted to the Victorian Age that moral earnestness which was its distinguishing characteristic."[28] Believers as well as unbelievers followed a code of beliefs and ethics associated with evangelicalism or "moral earnestness." To quote J.F.C. Harrison in Early Victorian Britain 1832 - 51:

> When we say...that the early Victorian period was a religious age we do not mean that everyone went to church (though a large proportion of the population in

> fact did so) but that Protestant evangelicalism was a basic ingredient in the dominant ideology. Men's values and standards, their assumptions and attitudes functioned within this context.[29]

Moral earnestness was a subject much discussed by literary figures, both Christians and agnostics. It was the root of the didactic authors' disapproval of social activities. Walter E. Houghton writes:

> The prophets of earnestness were attacking a casual, easy-going, superficial, or frivolous attitude, whether in intellectual or moral life; and demanding that men should think and live with a high and serious purpose.[30]

Those who were fervent Christians believed that all Christians had "a spiritual mission or calling to serve God in His eternal warfare with Satan":

> To that end he was to set before the world a high example of the Christian spirit: by his conversation, by a scrupulous fulfilment of all his duties, and by helping to carry forward the great battle against social evil and suffering. "Do we not know," asked Arnold in one of his sermons in Christian Life...that there is an infinite voice in the infinite sins and sufferings of millions which proclaims that the contest is raging around us; that every idle moment is treason; that now it is the time for unceasing efforts; and that not till the victory is gained may Christ's soldiers throw aside their arms, and resign themselves to enjoyment and to rest?" For the upper classes that broad mission centered, in Evangelical minds as well as Arnold's, on the object for which Wilberforce, among others, had founded the Society for Bettering the Condition and Increasing the Comforts of the Poor. An enormous amount of private charity complemented the long series of Parliamentary measures (prison reform, sanitation, the slave trade, factory acts, mine acts, laws for the prevention of cruelty to children and animals, etc.), and in both fields a primary motivation was the service of God.[31]

It is thus easy to see why social work or philanthropy played a greater part in nineteenth century didactic children's literature than social activities. Many men and women were well aware of the difficulties philanthrophy presented. Moreover, the passing of time has not made it a subject easier to explain or interpret. At this point, however, it is best left in the simple terms in which it was presented to children by a father in The Advantages of Education Elucidated:

> It is the duty of the rich, which I hope, my child, you will always attend to, to be kind to their servants and labourers, to consider we are all the children of God, and ought to live in love together. As far as we possibly can we ought to help the poor, for it is with that design God has blessed us with money; nor can we tell, my dear boy, how much we may at some time of our lives want assistance ourselves: therefore never turn away from a poor person with indifference, but if you can not relieve them, at least give them your good wishes and a feeling for their distress.[32]

In didactic children's literature, the degree of a family's participation in community social work was largely determined by the number of references in the story to its charitable activities. Charitable activities, it will be recalled, included both "active" charity--the actual dispensation of clothing, food, or money--and "passive" charity--good advice, religious tracts, even pious or humanitarian sentiments. The Fairchild family, for example, was considered highly involved in community social work. Not only did Mr. and Mrs. Fairchild have two schools in the village, one for poor boys and one for poor girls, which must have put them to considerable expense, they also readily dispensed charity whenever the opportunity arose. For example, on Lucy's birthday, Mr. Fairchild decided the family would visit a certain John Trueman, "a poor working man /who/ had a wife and six children," "and take some cake to his little children."[33] They would also visit Lucy's nurse, "a pious old woman," and "carry her some tea and sugar." These were both, of course, charity visits. The family had an unexpected opportunity to help the less fortunate, for when they arrived at John Trueman's cottage, they found his wife offering "a crust of bread and a bit of cheese" to a very poor woman who had stopped at the gate with a baby in her arms:

> "Why, Mary," said Mr. Fairchild, "I hope it is a sign that you are getting rich, as you have bread and cheese to spare."
> "Sir," she answered, "this poor woman is in want, and my children will never miss what I have given her."
> "You are very right," answered Mrs. Fairchild, "he that giveth to the poor, lendeth to the Lord; and the Lord will pay it again"; and at the same time she slipped a sixpence into the poor woman's hand.[34]

There were many such incidents of charity in the book. The parents actively encouraged their children to participate so that charity became a family concern.[35] The Fairchilds often went as a family to visit the charity schools, and the three children were responsible for bringing gifts to the good children.[36]

The varying lengths of the books and stories examined made it impossible to relate a specific number of incidents of social work to a category of involvement--high, medium, or low. The nature of the social work activity was also a factor. Surely operating a school for poor children indicated more involvement than the mere dispensation of good advice. Social class was also a factor. For a poor family, the actual size of the contribution would be less, but in proportion to the family's resources, the contribution, and hence the degree of involvement, would be very high. Each book or story, therefore, had to be examined individually in the light of these considerations. Again, as with social activities, not all family members were equally involved in community social work. Therefore, involvement will be considered separately for the father, mother, and children of each family.

With respect to the fathers' involvement in community social work, 29 were considered highly involved. It will be recalled that only 10 fathers were highly involved in community social activities. Given the large number of fathers who were highly involved in social work, the figures for moderate and low involvement are somewhat surprising--9 and 32 respectively. The degree of involvement of a further 49 fathers could not be determined.

Social class to a certain extent explained the high number of fathers who participated only very little in community social work. Although social class and social work involvement will be discussed at a later point, it can be noted here that the lower class made up more than half this group of low participation. Even though, as the example from The History of the Fairchild Family indicated, the poor were encouraged to do what they could to relieve others, many of them simply could not. Like the father in Legh Richmond's book, The Dairyman's Daughter, many fathers could barely provide for their wives and children let alone others. Other reasons for a father's low involvement in community social work included illness or disability, as in The Blind Farmer and His Children by Barbara Hofland, and advanced age as in Orphan Rachel.

The figures for the participation of mothers in community social work resembled those of the fathers. Thirty-one mothers were highly involved in social work in contrast to 7 who were highly involved in social activities. Twelve and 31 mothers were involved to a moderate and low extent respectively. Again, the high number of mothers only slightly involved or not at all involved may be explained by severe poverty, illness, disability, or advanced age. The degree of involvement of 45 mothers could not be determined.

The pattern of the social work involvement of children was much the same as that noted for parents. For the sake of simplicity, the involvement of one child of each sex was taken to represent the involvement of all the boys and all the girls in each family, regardless of the actual number of children of each sex in that family. Twenty-four boys were highly involved, 11 moderately involved, and 32 were involved to a very low extent or not at all. With respect to girls, 34 were highly involved, 14 moderately involved, and 27 were involved only to a very low extent or not at all. The degree of involvement of 52 boys and 44 girls could not be determined because of insufficient information or inapplicability.

Although the term social work has been defined, the only specific examples of it have been taken from The History of the Fairchild Family. The Fairchild family's activities were typical of the kinds of charitable activities that appeared in the literature, but more examples can be given.

Visiting the poor was a common charitable activity. It appeared, for example, in The Visit by Miss Grierson, Anna Ross by Grace Kennedy, Family Tales for Children by Amelia Stubbs, The History of Little Lucy, and Soffrona and Her Cat Muff by Mrs. Sherwood. In the latter book, two little girls, Sophia and Soffrona, made a flannel petticoat to take to a poor old woman. Their activity was decribed as follows:

> Now it was much to be wished that the petticoat should be done that night; for it was intended for a good old woman who lived in the woods, a very poor woman indeed, and the March winds had given her great pain in her limbs, and she was in much need of a warm petticoat; and, more than that, the lady /their mother/ had promised the little girls the pleasure of taking the petticoat, with some tea and sugar, the next morning, after they had repeated their lesson, to the cottage.[37]

In The Visit, the gift to the poor was not a petticoat but religious tracts.

An activity closely related to that of visiting the poor was visiting charity schools. Many families, like the Fairchild family and the family represented in The History of Little Lucy did both. Families brought rewards and gifts to the poor children who had behaved well, and the children of the benefactors invariably made a contribution of their own. As noted previously, it was a great treat for Lucy, Emily, and Henry Fairchild to go with their parents to the schools--indeed it was a favor granted only when the three had themselves behaved well.[38] In Gertrude by Eliza White, it was the little girl's task to make a frock to take to one of the poor girls at the charity school the next time her mother made a visit. Due to Gertrude's thoughtlessness and inattention, the frock was not finished in time for the promised visit, and the poor little girl had to go without. Her disappointment filled Gertrude with remorse. It was a lesson for Gertrude and other thoughtless little girls.

A small number of families actually adopted less fortunate children. In Flora by Elizabeth Somerville, a wealthy widow named Mrs. Friendly, found a deserted child, covered with bruises, by the side of the road. Believing that the child had been beaten and abandoned by her parents, Mrs. Friendly adopted her and named her Flora. Although Flora's true history was eventually discovered and she was returned to her real parents, Mrs. Friendly's benevolence was to be noted. In The Orphan Brothers by Mary Elliot, a kind farmer took in two motherless boys who had been deserted by their father. The farmer gave the boys food, shelter, and employment. In The History of Little Goody Two-Shoes, a worthy clergyman named Mr. Smith came to the aid of the orphans Tom and Margery Meanwell. He "made" little Tom a sailor and adopted Margery, agreeing to "breed her up with their family."[39] Although Mr. Smith later had to "discard" Margery because two parish tyrants, Sir Timothy Gripe and Farmer Graspall threatened to reduce his "tythes," he was, nonetheless, a charitable man. In Lucy Newton; or, An Experiment in Education, two maiden ladies adopted motherless Lucy, the daughter of one of their tenants. They intended to share some of their comforts with the child and provide her with a good moral education. The experiment was not particularly successful because the ladies had had little experience with children and could not agree on the proper methods of instruction. In Motherless Mary, a woman adopted a little girl, the daughter of a destitute neighbor who had died of illness and grief shortly after she had been turned out of her cottage by a cruel landlord. What was impressive about the first woman's charity was the fact that she too was very poor and could barely feed herself and her own daughter, let alone another child.

In addition to these "planned" acts of charity, there were many examples of "spontaneous" or "impulsive" charity, that is, charity given readily when a character was suddenly confronted with misery and distress. In The History of Little Lucy, for example, Lucy, moved by the plight of a poor girl whom she met in a shop, quickly gave that girl the money she had been given to buy a doll for her birthday. In Fabulous Histories, Mrs. Benson and her daughter Harriet were accosted by a poor woman as they made their way home one evening from a neighbor's house. The poor woman "entreated them to give her some relief, as she had a sick husband and seven children in a starving condition; of which, she said, they might be the eye-witness, if they would have the goodness to step into a barn hard by." As Mrs. Trimmer wrote:

> The invitation of wretchedness was never given in vain to Mrs. Benson; her heart was ever awake to the tender feelings of humanity; and taking her daughter by the hand, and desiring the servant to stop for her, she followed the woman, who conducted her to the mansions of real woe, where she beheld a father, surrounded with his helpless family, who he could no longer supply with sustenance; and he himself, though his disease was subdued, was almost on the point of expiring, for want of some reviving cordial.[40]

Mrs. Benson heard their story, and convinced of the seriousness of the case, said to the woman, "Well, comfort yourself ...I will take care of you all.--Come to my house tomorrow morning, and we will see what we can do; in the mean time here is something for a present supply."[41] The poor woman duly appeared at Mrs. Benson's house the next morning:

> Well, said the Lady, I am happy to find you in better spirits than you were last night, and do not doubt you will do very well. I will order some meat and bread to be sent to you every day this week, and will also assist you in clothing the children. Harriet's eyes glistened with benevolence at seeing the woman, whose distress had so greatly affected her, thus comforted; and slipping her purse, which contained seven shillings, into her mamma's hand, begged she would take it for the woman. You shall, my dear, said Mrs. Benson, have the pleasure of relieving her yourself; give this half-crown to her. Miss Harriet, with a delight which none but the compassionate can know, extended the hand of charity. The woman received her benefaction with grateful acknowlegements; and returned to her husband who every hour gathered strength.[42]

Although most of the above examples of community social work have featured the middle and upper classes relieving the lower class, it should not be assumed that the poor watched passively and did not become involved in charitable activities themselves. It should be recalled that when the Fairchild family, laden with gifts for poor John Trueman and his family arrived at the Trueman cottage, they found his wife giving bread and cheese to a destitute woman and her baby. Again it will be recalled that in Motherless Mary, a poor woman took an orphan into her home even though she had barely enough for herself and her own child. In The Factory Girl, a devout young girl employed in a cotton factory organized a Sunday school for her younger fellow employees. In The Good Grandmother and Her Offspring, the grandmother had to work hard to support her idle alcoholic husband, her indolent daughter-in-law, and her grandchildren. The grandchildren, however, were industrious and helped as much as they could. They did not complain about their poverty, and one little girl even had a thought for those less fortunate than herself. She spent her spare time knitting a baby cap for the butcher's wife.

The comfortable classes were, not surprisingly, more involved in community social work than the lower class. It is interesting that it was the middle class that led the upper class in charitable activity, but again, this is not surprising. The middle class did play the leading role in nineteenth century philanthropic activity in fact as well as in fiction. The middle class set the social and moral tone for the whole of nineteenth century society and was, in effect, society's conscience. As far as didactic children's literature is concerned, it will be recalled that the majority of fictional families, 67 out of 119, were considered middle class. The following table indicates the relationship between social class and charitable activity as presented in the literature. It must be emphasized that the table gives only an impression of the relationship, not an accurate or complete picture, for the degree of involvement of just one parent was taken to represent the degree of involvement of the whole family. Because, as it was noted above, the degree of involvement of family members was not always equal, some duplication did occur. It must be recalled as well that for a number of families in each social class the level of participation in community social work could not be determined.

TABLE 7

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SOCIAL CLASS AND PHILANTHROPIC ACTIVITY

Social Class	Degree of Involvement		
	High	Moderate	Low
Number of Upper Class Families	8	8	13
Middle Class	24	6	15
Lower Class	2	1	12

There were 31 upper class families, 67 middle class, and 21 lower class families represented in the literature.

These figures clearly indicate that nineteenth century philanthropy cannot be discussed without reference to social class. When the element of religion is brought forward, as it surely must, the subject becomes increasingly complex. It will be recalled that the Victorian period was referred to as an age of "moral earnestness." The Evangelical movement in the Church of England had affected and even transformed the whole character of English society. Believers as well as unbelievers followed a code of beliefs associated with evangelicalism or "moral earnestness." Evangelicalism, therefore, could be called a social force. However, to quote J. F. C. Harrison in Early Victorian Britain 1832 - 51:

> Religion as a social force operated at a number of different levels. For the middle classes, evangelical fervour could find an outlet either in a philanthropy calculated to mitigate, without changing the social basis of the evils of industrial society, or in schemes for radical social reform. Among the working classes religion could be at once a consolation and a sedative, or an inspiration in the struggle for social justice.[44]

To suggest that middle class philanthropists were not deeply moved by the plight of the poor, that their religious fervour and sense of Christian duty were not sincere, would be unfair. And yet to argue that class interest, a desire to control the lower classes was not a very real aspect of nineteenth century philanthropy would be naive indeed. It does not take very wide or deep reading of nineteenth century literature to realize that "Victorian society, particularly in the period before 1850, was shot through, from top to bottom, with the dread of some wild outbreak of the masses that would overthrow the established order and confiscate private property."[45] This fear was expressed as early as 1790 by Edmund Burke in Reflections on the Revolution in France. As Walter E. Houghton writes in The Victorian Frame of Mind 1830 - 1870:

> /Burke's/ note of warning...echoes through Southey's Colloquies on the Progress and Prospects of Society (1829), and rings in tones of fright through the literature of the forties. Carlyle's French Revolution (1837) and even Dickens' Tale of Two Cities (1859) are tracts for the times.
> The possibility that it might happen here was abundantly supported, a priori, by the spread of radical propaganda, both political and religious, among the working classes.[46]

There was a definite connection between the fear of revolution and philanthropy as E. P. Thompson explains in The Making of the English Working Class:

> The awakening of the labouring classes, after the first shocks of the French Revolution, made the upper classes tremble; Frances, Lady Shelly noted in her Diary: 'Every man felt the necessity for putting his house in order...'
> To be more accurate, most men and women of property felt the necessity for putting the houses of the poor in order. The remedies proposed might differ; but the impulse behind Colquhoun, with his advocacy of more effective police, Hannah More, with her halfpenny tracts and Sunday schools, the Methodists with their renewed emphasis upon order and submissiveness, Bishop Barrington's more humane Society for Bettering the Conditions of the Poor, and William Wilberforce and Dr. John Bowdler, with their Society for the Suppression of Vice and Encouragement of Religion, was much the same. The message to be given the labouring poor was simple, and was summarized by Burke in the famine year of 1795: 'Patience, labour, sobriety, frugality and religion, should be recommended to them; all the rest is downright fraud'....The sensibility of the Victorian middle class was nurtured in the 1790's by frightened gentry who had seen miners, potters and cutlers reading Rights of Man and its foster-parents were William Wilberforce and Hannah More. It was in these counter-revolutionary decades that the humanitarian tradition became warped beyond recognition.[47]

Thompson's criticism of nineteenth century humanitarianism is severe, but he gives a sense of the way in which philanthropy, religion, and social class became inextricably linked.

It is possible to see the upper and middle class desire to control the masses in a less sinister light. It can be seen as an outgrowth of both traditionalism and romanticism. Edmund Burke, sometimes referred to as "the first modern conservative,"[48] saw society as a contract, a partnership:

> Society is indeed a contract....It is a partnership in all art; a partnership in every virtue, and all perfection. As the ends of such a partnership cannot be obtained in many generations, it becomes a partnership not only between those who are living, those who are dead, and those who are to be born. Each contract of each particular state is but a clause in the great primeval contract of eternal society, linking the lower with the higher natures, connecting the visible and invisible world, according to a fixed compact sanctioned by the inviolable oath which holds all physical and moral natures, each in their appointed place.[49]

Burke saw the state as the necessary agent of human perfection. In his works he emphasized order, stability, and stressed the need to maintain continuity between the past and the present. The great noble families, he believed, should rule as trustees for the nation.[50] Burke saw society in terms of the whole rather than in terms of the parts with separate, isolated, or competing interests. This has been called an "organic" view of society. Unlike some of his contemporaries, Burke saw society as essentially benevolent rather than oppressive.

Burke's view of the well-ordered, organic society was not unlike that of Thomas Carlyle. Carlyle has been seen variously as a romantic because of his "medievalism," a radical because of his criticism of the governing classes and industrialism and his sympathy for the working classes, and a conservative because he called for "more government, not less; more order, not less."[51] Carlyle, like Burke, believed it was the duty of the upper classes to govern society.

Burke's organic society reappeared in Carlyle's idyllic description of life in the Medieval past in Past and Present published in 1843.[52]

In the confusion and disruption of the Industrial Age, it is not surprising that such visions of order and stability should have had an appeal. Nor is it hard to see how a desire for peace, stability, and order could be transformed by fear and insecurity into a desire for social control. As passages from Reflections on the Revolution in France and Past and Present indicate, a justification for social control could be placed firmly in the past. But it is important to realize that men like Burke and Carlyle did not see their views as menacing or oppressive. Similarly, the great philanthropists like William Wilberforce and Hannah More, who also believed in a well-ordered society, saw themselves as humanitarians not as oppressors of the lower classes. In their well-ordered, stable societies, all men knew their duties, their places, their relationships to one another, and as Carlyle put it, "No human creature then [in the Middle Ages] went about connected with nobody; left to go his way into Bastilles [workhouses] or worse, under Laissez-faire; reduced to prove his relationship by dying of typhus-fever!"[53]

In the view of many men of letters and well meaning philanthropists, the human misery so evident in this Industrial Age was caused by a severe dislocation in the organization of society. Once the proper order was restored, once men remembered or were taught their proper relationships to one another--the relationships divinely ordained, so some like Burke believed--human suffering would be alleviated.

Many of the conflicting desires and motives that characterized nineteenth century philanthropy can be readily seen in didactic children's literature. One common theme was that of the well-ordered society. In The Advantages of Education Elucidated, a father explained to his young son Augustus the nature of the relationship between the classes:

> But why, Papa /asked Augustus/ are there any poor people? Why have not all men money enough, a good house, and good cloaths /sic/ like us? Have the poor people displeased God, that makes him keep those good things from them?"
> "No, my dear child," said his father, "but it is necessary that in this world there should be both rich and poor. Consider, Augustus, were not people willing to be servants and labourers, how should I get the business either of my house or farm done; and were all poor, how should they get employment, as it is the rich that excites them to industry. It is the duty of the poor to be respectful and honest to those that employ them, to be content in their humble situation, and love the Great God, who careth as much for them as for the greatest king on earth; and it is the duty of the rich, which I hope, my child you will always attend to, to be kind to their servants and labourers, to consider we are all children of God, and ought to live in love together.[54]

Much the same view of society was expressed in The Two Edwards by Mary Elliot. When Brown Ned, a poor boy, exclaimed to Mr. Dodd, the clergyman, "I like none of your grand folks, not I," the gentleman replied:

> If the rich had no fields to cultivate, what would become of those who get their living by cultivating them? Your grandfather's labour supported you while an infant, this labour was paid by a rich man; now you are able to get your own living, but however willing to do so, unless these grand folks employed you, what would you do for work? Small farmers cannot afford to give great wages, or engage so many hands as the rich gentry do,

> and when their labourers get old, there is no resource but a workhouse, for few save enough for the comforts of age; therefore, when that sad period arrives, it is good to have a rich and kind landlord."[55]

The necessity of understanding the organization of society was emphasized throughout The Two Edwards. It was a lesson to be learned by both the rich and the poor. Brown Ned learned this lesson from the clergyman, and he was able to apologize for his rudeness without shame to Master Edward Mason, the young gentleman hero of the book:

> "Master Mason," said he /Brown Ned/ "I know I have treated you very rudely, I believe insolently. It was partly your own fault; but I own I had a pack of foolish notions in my head about rich people being hard-hearted and useless, and this nonsense made me think too much of us country folk and our services. Mr. Dodd has opened my eyes, and shewn me plainly we must always be bettered by your assistance, and that we may pay you respect without being mean and cringing, which I am sure I never could be to the first lord in the land. I am not ashamed, therefore, to tell you I am sorry for my behavior yesterday and the day before, and hope that you will overlook it."[56]

Young Edward had to learn this lesson too, for when he expressed a wish to take home to London some of his new country acquaintances, most of whom were servants or labourers on his uncle's estate, the latter said:

> "Ah! My dear boy...I fear that would be a bad plan; our Wiltshire favorites...would cast a bad figure in London; they would be quite out of place, and therefore useless. Now here they are of some consequence, can serve themselves and others too. No, we cannot part with them, they will shine best in their own hemisphere; so that when you wish to see them to advantage you must return to Prosper Farm, and gladden us all by your presence."[57]

Finally Edward observed:

> I now perfectly understand my uncle's observation, that 'we are all links of the same chain--one cannot be loosened without injuring the whole; it is policy, as well as virtue, to cling to one another', and sincerely

> do I hope that my future conduct may never weaken the smallest part of the best security of society.[58]

Thus the concept of a "great chain of being," so popular with the Victorians, was introduced in didactic children's literature.

Preservation of the proper order of society meant that a clear distinction between the classes had to be maintained. The poor were to be helped to improve their condition, but that improvement was to occur within their social class. The poor were not to be encouraged to rise above their station. When Mr. Dalben and Henry took in a poor Irish orphan in The History of Henry Milner, Mr. Dalben cautioned Henry that the orphan would not be raised in the same fashion as Henry. The gentleman imagined that the orphan's father would say that it was his wish

> that he /the boy/ might be brought up piously in the condition of life in which he was born...he would say, bring up my boy in the fear of God, keep him in humility, raise him not above his station; teach him to do well and to hate sin; and may the blessings of the new covenant attend your labours.[59]

Henry, who lived alone with his uncle, naturally welcomed the Irish boy as a playmate, and even wished to have the boy share his room. Henry obviously did not see that the Irish orphan "stood convicted of the crime of being as dirty as Irish habits, united with extreme poverty and long neglect, could possibly render him."[60] Mr. Dalben took matters firmly in hand and warned Henry "not to make too free with this little boy; but to be kind to him without passing over those lines of distinction which must ever subsist between different degrees of society."[61]

> Be always kind to those below you, dear boy; provide for their comforts; speak civilly to them; enter into their feelings, and deny yourself for their sakes; but do not descend to familiarity, any more than you would presume to be free with the son of a king who might show you any favour.[62]

Much the same view of the relationships between the classes was reflected in Ashford Rectory by Frances Jamieson. Mrs. Villars, the rector's wife, told her children:

> Poor people in general...have but little idea of the proper management of a family; and it is in the power of everyone, who has been well brought up, to assist their neighbours by friendly advice and consolation; though the means of supplying their wants must depend greatly upon their own industry, and the liberality of the more wealthy part of the community.[63]

This passage indicates that the poor were not exempt from the responsibility of their condition. The point was brought forth more forcefully in Thomas Beddoes book, The History of Isaac Jenkins. As Mr. Longford, the sententious surgeon stated:

> I wish with all my heart things could be so ordered that every poor family should be comfortably clad and plentifully fed, and have besides wherewithal to make decently merry at times; and I hope this may come to be the case. And so it may be in many a family at present, if the father did not sottishly waste upon himself the wages he gets: and they were laid out for the support and comfort of them all. But labouring men must first learn the difference between beastliness and cheerfulness, and they must be disposed to share every farthing they can afford to spend, in making merry with their wives and children at home.[64]

Yet the author admitted that

> Vice often begins among the poor from misery, as among the rich from idleness....I believe, for my part, that the poor are well disposed, and do wrong oftener for want of knowing better than from wretchedness of heart.[65]

Overall, the lower class families presented in the literature were not dissatisfied with their positions, or if they were, as was Brown Ned in The Two Edwards, their opinions were soon altered, usually by a well-meaning middle or upper class philanthropist.

To accept one's station in life and to be satisfied with it was a lesson properly learned in childhood. As Hannah More wrote in The Good Mother's Legacy:

> Mrs. Adams' eldest daughter Mary, being brought up under so good a mother, turned out exactly like her; for, by being kept in her youth out of evil company, she was preserved from falling into those temptations which prove the ruin of so many young women. Her dress was neat, modest, and suitable to her station; for as to ruffles and flounces, long-tailed gowns, and hair curled half way down the back, she thought them very unbecoming a farmer's daughter, whose business it was to carry a milk-pail; though, to be sure, now-a-days, it is a sight commonly seen: and she looked so neat at church every Sunday, that it made all the girls in the parish ashamed of their frippery.[66]

In Idle Ann by Mary Elliot, even the prospect of a special children's feast given by a local aristocrat, Lady Oakes, did not alter Ann's parents' very definite views on child-rearing:

> Ann's parents were too wise to think of dressing her in gay clothes, as if she, too, were a great lady; they knew that to be clean and neat was enough for a child in her station of life, and the surest way of gaining respect themselves; and to do Ann justice, she had no silly notions of pride; and, therefore desired no more than a plain frock and new shoes.[67]

Probably the character most satisfied with his lot was the aged shepherd in Hannah More's book, The Shepherd of Salisbury Plain:

> You think then, said the gentleman, that a laborious life is a happy one. I do, Sir /said the shepherd/; and more so especially as it exposes a man to fewer sins. If King Saul had continued a poor laborious man to the end of his days, he might have lived happy and honest, and died a natural death in his bed at last, which you know, Sir, was far more than he did. But I speak with reverence; for it was Divine Providence overruled all that, you know, Sir; I do not presume to make comparisons. Besides, Sir, my employment has been particularly honoured: Moses was a shepherd in the plains of Midian. It was to "shepherds keeping their flocks by night," that the angels appeared in Bethlehem to tell the best news, the gladest tidings, that ever were revealed to poor sinful men: often and often has the thought warmed my poor heart, in the coldest night, and filled me with more joy and thankfulness than the best supper could have done.[68]

4. Other Forms of Social Interaction

Interaction between the family, the household and the community took simpler, more straight forward forms than participation in such social activities as parties and dances or philanthropy. Contact with neighbours, the origins of household servants, and visitors to the household cannot be overlooked in determining the relationship between the family and the household and the community. Less intensive forms of interaction were an important part of the total relationship. Some families that did not participate to any great extent in social activities or social work, either through choice or circumstances, were nonetheless reasonably good friends and neighbors. An example of such a family occurred in The History of Farmer Darwin and His Family by Ann Selwyn. A series of crises left farmer Darwin and his family so poor that there was very little time or money for social activities or philanthropy. Yet this family saw their neighbors on a regular if not frequent basis. The members of the family did not isolate themselves from the community. Families that employed servants from the community would be expected to have a rather closer relationship with the community than otherwise, for presumably the servants would form a link between the household and the community. Similarly, those who received visitors, particularly from the community, would necessarily have a closer relationship with the community and probably a greater interest in its affairs. In order, therefore, to gain a better sense of the overall relationship between the family, the household, and the community, it is necessary to examine these less intense social relationships.

i. Degree of Contact Between the Houshold and Neighbors

By far the majority of households depicted in the literature enjoyed a moderate degree of contact with neighbors. These households, 81 out of 119, saw their neighbors several times in the course of the story. The Fairchild family was such a family. To begin with, they maintained a regular although not frequent association with the local aristocratic family:

> Twice a year Sir Charles and Lady Noble used to invite Mr. and Mrs. Fairchild and their children to spend a day with them at their house. Mr. and Mrs. Fairchild did not much like to go, because Sir Charles and his Lady were very proud, and their children were not brought up in the fear of God; yet, as the visit happened only twice in a year, Mr. Fairchild thought it better to go than have a quarrel with his neighbour.[69]

On another occasion, the family paid a two day visit to Mrs. Goodwill and another shorter visit to Mary Bush.

They also received the rector for tea and dinner. At one point in the book, when the family received the distressing news of the death of Sir Charles Noble's daughter, a neighbor, Mrs. Barker, appeared to comfort Mrs. Fairchild and the children. Mrs. Barker was described as "a kind woman; and as she lived by herself, was always at liberty to go amongst her neighbors in times of trouble."[70] On Sundays, "unless something very particular happened, Mrs. Barker was always ready to come out, and go with Mrs. Fairchild to the school," and later join Mrs. Fairchild and the family in church.[71] On those Sunday evenings when the family could not go to church, Mr. Fairchild held a service in his home and invited "the two old women who lived in the coppice, who generally drank tea with Betty /the servant/ on a Sunday evening" to join his little congregation.[72]

Far fewer households enjoyed a high or low degree of contact with neighbors--9 and 11 households respectively. A high degree of contact was indicated by a much greater frequency of contacts than that considered moderate as exemplified by the Fairchild family. A low degree of contact meant that the family or household in question saw their neighbors rarely if at all in the course of the story. With respect to those households that enjoyed a high level of contact with their neighbors, only 2 were not members of the middle and upper class. Although it might not be surprising that the families who had this degree of contact with neighbors were also highly involved in community social activities, it is nonetheless interesting that all families except one had a very low level of involvement in community social work. The one exception was only moderately involved at that. In 2 situations, the low level of involvement in philanthropy could be explained by social and economic conditions. In The History of Little Goody Two-Shoes, Goody enjoyed a high degree of contact with her neighbors by virtue of her activities as a "Trotting Tutoress." For the greater part of the book, however, Goody was very poor. Only through great industry and perseverance was she able to win fame and eventually fortune by gaining the attention of the local gentleman. In The Faithful Nurse by Caroline Maxwell, the mother's small business demanded that this poor family maintain a high degree of contact with neighbors.

With respect to those families that had little contact with their neighbors, all social classes were almost equally represented. These families also appeared to have little contact with the community in social activities or philanthropy. Only one family, that presented in Employment by Diana Bayley, could be said to have even a moderate degree of involvement in community social work, and only the Jennet family in The Holiday Present by Dorothy Kilner had a moderate degree of involvement in social activities.

For 18 families the degree of contact with neighbors could not be determined.

ii. The Origin of Visitors to the Household

The majority of families, 55 out of 119, received visitors from both the community and outside. Mr. and Mrs. Fairchild, it will be recalled, entertained their neighbors Mrs. Barker and the rector, but they also received the rather unpleasant Mr. Crosbie and his family from London. In The Two Mothers by Mrs. Cameron, the Grove family, the family of a Worcestershire clergyman, received Mrs. Grove's sister and her niece from Coventry as well as neighbors.

Thirty-seven families appeared to receive visitors only from the community, while a much smaller number, 6, received visitors from outside the community only. These two groups posed something of a problem in a number of cases, as in Fabulous Histories in the former group, and The History of Little Frank and His Sister by Mrs. Cameron in the latter group. It is highly probable, were one dealing with reality rather than fiction, that an upper class family like the Bensons would have received visitors from outside the community, and a middle class family like that presented in Mrs. Cameron's book would have received visitors from the community. However, in both books, the probable did not occur.

In only 11 books and stories were no visitors noted, and in another 10 books and stories there was insufficient information to determine the presence or absence of visitors or their origins.

While the figures do present difficulties, it can be said that the overwhelming majority of families and households did receive visitors whether from the community or outside or both. Social class did not appear to be a factor in the presence or absence of visitors or their origins.

iii. The Origin of Household Servants

It was not possible to obtain any significant information about the nature of the relationship between the family, the household, and the community in the literature through the characters of the household servants. The latter did not act as a link between the household and the community. Despite the fact that servants appeared in 90 out of 119 households, very little information was given about them. In many cases, although only one or two servants were actually named or presented, it was clear from the context of the story that many more servants must have been employed in the household. Servants in fiction, as in real life, were "a status symbol, necessary not only to good housekeeping but to self-respect and social dignity."[73] In the literature, the servant seldom had a "personal identity" or even a memorable characteristic. Few were given names let alone a character or a personality.[74] Boosy, the faithful Indian servant of little Henry in The History of Little Henry and His Bearer by Mrs. Sherwood was given considerably more character than most servants. Boosy tried to learn the Bible to please his young master and even became a Christian after Henry's death. Boosy was portrayed as a simple but loving and devoted individual. At the other extreme was the thoroughly evil, faithless and cruel servant presented in The

First Theft by Mrs. Marshall. This servant was given some character, even if it was a terrible one. She had no scruples about initiating a little girl into the world of crime. Yet even in these two books, almost no information was given about the servants themselves apart from their relationship to the household and various family members. It is not surprising, therefore, that the origin of household servants could be determined only in 4 books and stories. Boosy in The History of Little Henry and His Bearer and Mrs. Kitty, Mr. Dalben's housekeeper in The History of Henry Milner, both lived in the community before they took employment in their masters' households. One male servant in The Adopted Daughter by Elizabeth Sandham (1815) and another in Harriet and Her Cousin (1823) came from outside the community to work in their masters' households. In the former book, 1 female servant came from the community and another came from outside the community.

5. The Location of the Children's Schooling

Where the children of a family receive their schooling may be an important factor in the type of relationship a family shares with the community in fiction no less than in real life. It would be assumed that families that sent their children to a community school would enjoy a closer relationship with the community. Typically, children bring adults together, and much community activity centers on the neighborhood or community school. But the location of schooling was a less important factor in community relationships in nineteenth century England, and this was naturally reflected in didactic children's literature. Economic and social factors played a great part in determining the type of education a child would receive, if indeed he received an education at all. It was not until the latter part of the century that schooling became common for all social classes. Previously, many children, upper class as well as lower class, did not receive any formal education at all. As J. F. C. Harrison notes:

> In 1851 there were nearly five million children of school age, that is between three and fifteen. Of these, 600,000 were at work, two million were in school, and the remainder were neither at work or school.[75]

The situation can hardly have been much better between 1815 and 1837. Among those children that did receive some form of formal education, social and economic factors rather than community associations dictated the location of schooling. The subject will be discussed in the following chapter, but some introductory statements can be made here to illustrate this point.

Thirty-five out of 119 fictional families provided education for their sons at home. This education was given by one or both parents, a governess, or a tutor.[76] All social classes were represented here. In many cases, the upper and middle classes chose to educate their sons at home because schools in the community were not always of a sufficiently high standard.[77] Of course there was the added element of social pride. In these families, if the sons were to go to schools at all, an élite boarding school education was often preferred. With respect to the lower classes, some families educated their sons at home simply because they could not afford to send them to school even if instruction was provided free of cost by a local philanthropist. The few pennies a child might earn could help feed the family or pay the rent, and the boy would have to learn what he could at home in his free time. Such was the case in _The History of Margaret Whyte_ by Mrs. Cameron (1827) and _The Little Woodman and his Dog Caesar_ by Mrs. Sherwood. The boys received some religious instruction, and William, the little woodman, learned to read the Bible with his grandmother.

Only 5 families sent their sons to schools in the community. Social and economic circumstances were a factor here, for 3 of these families were lower class and 2 were middle class. The schools attended by the lower class boys were charity or church schools, whereas the schools attended by the middle class boys in _Anna Ross_ by Grace Kennedy and _The Truant Reclaimed_ (1825) were a better class of school.

In 13 families, boys were sent out of the community for their schooling or instruction. Six of these families were upper class families, 5 were middle class, and only 2 were lower class. The upper and middle class boys were sent to boarding schools for a specialized or élite education, as in _The Willoughby Family_ by Mrs. Cameron and _Improvement_ by Diana Bayley. The lower class boys represented in _The History of Farmer Darwin and his Family_ by A. Selwyn and _The History of Goody Two-Shoes_, were sent out of the community to take up apprenticeships.

In a number of families the sons received their education in more than one location, and each location was given equal emphasis by the authors. These combinations will be discussed in the following chapter, but it can be noted that social and economic factors were important here as well.

Social and economic factors were less significant in the education of girls than of boys because the philosophy of education for girls differed considerably. As Richard D. Altick writes in Victorian People and Ideas, "until fairly late in the century...the female brain was not considered equal to the demands of commerce or the professions, and women, simply by virtue of their sex, had no business mingling with men in a man's world."[78] Accordingly, the education of girls, whatever their social class, was given far less attention than that for boys. As Thomas Henry Huxley stated, girls were educated "to be either drudges or toys beneath man, or an angel above him."[79]

Given this attitude toward the education of girls in the nineteenth century, it is hardly surprising to find that by far the majority of girls in the literature were educated at home. Fifty-five families provided no formal education or schooling for their daughters. Although the number of families that provided no formal education for their sons was large, 35 families, the numerical difference is important. Like many boys in the literature, Henry Fairchild received no formal education in the course of the story, but there was every indication that he would go to school in the future, for his father wished him to become a clergyman. There was no such promise of further education for his sisters.

It is interesting that a greater number of families sent their daughters to community schools than their sons. Fourteen families sent their daughters to such schools, whereas only 5 sent their sons. The reasons for such a difference are not certain, but it is possible that this reflects a belief, accurate in many cases, that community schools were not of very high quality. Such a school might not be good enough for the son but acceptable for the daughter whose prospects were much more limited. Social class was also a factor in the attendance of girls at community schools, as it was with boys, but to a lesser extent. Where no upper class families sent their sons to community schools, 3 such families sent their daughters there. Although 4 middle class families sent their daughters to community schools, the greatest number of those who took advantage of them were again lower class.

Six families sent their daughters outside the community for schooling, and here social class considerations played the greatest part. The families in question were all upper and middle class families, and the schools were élite boarding schools. Discussion of girls who received their education in more than one location will be left to the following chapter where education will be a major concern.

As the evidence presented in this section indicates, the location of education had little effect on the relationship between the family, the household, and the community.

6. The Children's Primary Place of Recreation

A child's preferred place of recreation, at home, in the community, or both, must surely reflect something of the family's attitude toward the community. If a family is generally hostile to the community and takes little interest in its social, cultural, or philanthropic activities, if a family truly constructs for itself a "stifling fortress of emotional bonding," it seems unlikely that the child of such a family will have much to do with the world outside. His experience might be similar to that of Edmund Gosse:

> But in memory, my childhood was long, long with interminable hours, hours with the pale cheek pressed against the windowpane, hours of mechanical and repeated lonely 'games', which had lost their savour, and were kept going by sheer inertness. Not unhappy, not fretful, but long,--long, long. It seems to me, as I look back to the life in the motherless Islington house, as I resumed it in that slow eighth year of my life, that time had ceased to move. There was a whole age between one tick of the eight-day clock in the hall, and the next tick. When the milkman went his rounds in our grey street, with his eldritch scream over the top of each set of area railings, it seemed as though he would never disappear again. There was no past and no future for me, and the present felt as though it were sealed up in a Leyden jar. Even my dreams were interminable, and hung stationary from the nightly sky.
> At this time, the street was my theatre, and I spent long periods, as I have said, leaning against the window. I feel now the coldness of the pane, and the feverish heat that was produced, by contrast, in the orbit around the eye.[80]

It is little wonder that he complained, "I had still no idea of the relations of human beings to one another....I had no humanity...."[81]

There was very little indication of such isolation in pre-Victorian children's literature. Very few boys and girls amused themselves primarily at home, and by far the majority played both at home and in the community.

In only 8 families did the boys amuse themselves primarily at home. Two particularly familiar fictional families were in this group--the Fairchild family and the Benson family in Mrs. Trimmer's Fabulous Histories. Although the children of both families occasionally visited friends and neighbors and thus amused themselves away from home, by and large, the visits were short and had a didactic purpose. Some of them were not particularly enjoyed by the children. For example, in The History of the Fairchild Family, the visit to the home of Sir Charles and Lady Noble was not an enjoyable occasion for either parents or children. Henry expressed great relief when the visit was over:

> "Well," said little Henry, "Sir Charles Noble's may be a very fine house, and everything may be very fine in it; but I like my own little home and garden, and John and the meadow, and the apple trees, and the round hill, and the lane, better than all the fine things at Sir Charles's."[82]

Social class did not appear to be a significant factor in a child's preference to play at home. Three families were middle class, 4 were upper class, and 1 was lower class. What seemed to be a more important consideration than social class was that none of these families participated in community social activities to any great extent or had much contact with neighbors. Only the Fairchild family and the Wingfield family presented in The Advantages of Education Elucidated were highly involved in community social work.

Very few boys found their primary place of recreation to be the community. Since only 3 families were involved here, little can be said about social class relationships. It can be noted, however, that no upper class boys chose the community as their primary place of recreation. Two of the families were middle class and the other was lower class. It is not difficult to understand why the boys of the latter family, the Jenkins family in The History of Isaac Jenkins, preferred to play in the community rather than at home. Before their father changed his ways, the house was little more than a hovel, filthy and sorely in need of repairs. A before and after illustration in the book amplified the author's description. It would have been surprising indeed if the children had wanted to play at home.

In the majority of fictional families, 58, the boys played both at home and in the community. Due to insufficient information or inapplicability, the primary place of recreation for the boys of 50 families could not be determined.

The figures for the preferred place of recreation for girls closely resembled those for boys. The fictional families in both were in many cases the same and therefore, social class relationships, if they existed, were repeated. In 9 families, the girls played primarily at home. Of these families, 4 were upper class, 4 middle class, and 1 lower class.

In 3 families, the girls played primarily in the community. The social class relationships remained the same here as for boys.

In 73 families the girls played equally at home and in the community. There appeared to be more information in the stories about the preferred place of recreation of girls than of boys. For 34 families of girls, in contrast to 50 families for boys, information about the primary place of recreation was insufficient or not applicable.

7. Family Interaction with Different Social Classes

An overall measure of a fictional family's relationship with the community was in the way the family responded to other families of different social classes in the literature. This measure included other forms of interaction discussed to this point. Certain types of community involvement largely determined the kind of social class interaction that took place. For example, in philanthropic activities, unless the family dispensing relief to a lower class family was itself a lower class family, social class interaction took place. On the other hand, many social activities such as parties and dances were more exclusive. The upper and middle classes did not normally invite the lower classes to their parties and dances.

An overview of the various forms of community interaction indicated that more than half of the fictional families did interact to some extent at least with other social classes. The following table illustrates the nature of the interaction according to social class. It must be noted that the nature of social class interaction could not be determined for 14 families. The total number of families represented therefore is 105 rather than 119.

TABLE 8

FAMILY INTERACTION WITH DIFFERENT SOCIAL CLASSES

Social Class	Contact With Other Social Classes	Contact With Same Social Class Only	Not Applicable	Total
Upper	17	12	2	31
Middle	40	18	10	67
Lower	12	6	2	21
Total	69	36	14	119

These figures show that in each social class, more than half the families had some contact with other social classes. The middle classes, followed by the lower classes had the most contact with other classes. This may reflect the fact that in real life, these two classes would have the most opportunity for interaction through professions, service, trades, and labor. The upper classes would have less direct contact with other social classes because intermediaries could take care of many routine transactions. It should be noted that the high involvement of the middle classes in philanthropy was an important factor in their high degree of social interaction.

IV. The Religious Relationship Between the Family, the Household, and the Community

1. The Religious Denomination of the Family

The religious relationship between the family, the household, and the community is as important as the economic, social, and cultural relationships. It is well known that religious beliefs can bring members of the community together or drive them apart. But in the literature, even though religion played a very important if not central role in the lives of the fictional families, there was very little reference to specific doctrinal beliefs. The religious strictures and sentiments were Christian rather than particular to any one religious group. It was unrealistic, therefore, to try to determine the religious denomination of most fictional families. Because the Church of England was the official or established church of the nation, it was assumed that if a family appeared to be religious, and if no specific reference was made to another religious denomination, that family would be a member of the Church of England. Eighty-three families were included in this group. Twenty-six of these families were considered upper class, 43 middle class, and 14 lower class.

Only 2 families could be considered Nonconformists with any degree of certainty because specific reference was made either by the author or one of the characters. In Harriet and Her Cousin the religious denomination was given by the author as Methodist. The story centered on Harriet, a little girl who had a religious revelation following the death of her younger brother. Harriet became a Methodist and successfully converted her grandfather and her cousin. In What Trade Shall I Be? Methodism was strongly suggested in a single incident by the response of one character. When the mother proposed a prayer following the family's decision to emigrate to Canada, her son replied, "O, Mother! If this is your method, I shall be a Methodist in this affair at least."[83] These two families were members of the upper and middle classes respectively.

One interesting exception to this division of families into Church of England and Nonconformist occurred in The Good Grandmother and Her Offspring by Barbara Hofland. The grandmother was a member of the established Church and raised her children in that faith. Yet in her later years, for practical reasons, she became a Nonconformist. In the following passage, which is noteworthy for its expression of religious tolerance, the old woman explained her circumstances to a Church of England clergyman:

> Grandmother: I was one of your congregation and the minister who went before you for upwards of forty years. When I went to my present house, I was thrown at so great a distance from Church, that on account of my rheumatism I could not go thither, and so I went to Mr. Pritchard's, because I thought wherever God had a house open, it was a Christian's duty to enter it and join in public worship rather than stay at home, and as it were, refuse to keep the Sabbath.
> Clergyman: You were right, good woman, perfectly right. Religion has too many enemies in this day to afford losing a single friend under whatever denomination that friend may be ranked.[84]

For 33 families the religious denomination could not be determined. In a number of cases there was either insufficient information in the story to make any decision or the family appeared to have little interest in religion as in The History of Isaac Jenkins. There were a number of families that were extremely religious but speculation would have been unwise. For example, in The Scottish Orphans by Isabella Stoddart (1822), the family could have been either Presbyterian or Roman Catholic. Because the story occurred in Scotland and involved a Scottish family, one might assume that the family belonged to the Presbyterian or national Church of Scotland. However, the story centered on the three orphans of a Scottish gentleman who had been executed for supporting the Stuarts. Because the Stuarts and many of their followers were Catholics or had Catholic sympathies, the gentleman and his family, and the tenant of that gentleman who ultimately rescued the children and gave them a home, could have been Catholics as well. All were simply presented as good Christians. There was nothing in the story to suggest affiliation with any religious denomination. In another three books, the families presented were also deeply religious. In one family indeed, that presented in Nina, An Icelandic Tale by Maria Budden, the eldest son became a clergyman. But these three stories, Nina and Claudine Maria Budden, and Emily and Henrietta by William Francis Sullivan[85] were all set outside Britian, in Iceland, Switzerland, and Germany respectively, and did not involve any British families. These families would not be Church of England members nor would they be Nonconformists in the English sense, that is, dissenters from the Church of England. Again, these families were presented as pious Christian families with no reference to any specific religious denomination. To assume that they were members of the predominant church in their respective countries would be unwise.

2. Sunday Worship

Only 3 families appeared never to attend church on Sunday. These families appeared in Emily, A Tale for Young Persons, The History of Little Henry and His Bearer by Mrs. Sherwood, and The Family Mansion by Ann Taylor. The families concerned were worldy upper and middle class families. The only real reference to chapel attendance appeared in Barbara Hofland's book, The Good Grandmother and Her Offspring. The grandmother in this book, it will be recalled, attended Church of England services for some forty years until she moved and distance and her rheumatism dictated that she attend chapel instead. She believed in the value of community worship.

Forty-three fictional families attended church regularly on Sundays. Interestingly enough, the greatest number of these families, relatively speaking, were upper class families. Fourteen out of a possible 31 upper class families attended the established church. The lower class was also well represented--9 out of a possible 21 families. The middle class was represented by only 20 out of a possible 67 families.

For 72 fictional families no definite information could be obtained about the nature of Sunday worship. However, of this number, 40 families were presented as religious, and it would not have strained the reader's imagination to find these families in church or chapel.

The joys and comforts of community worship were best described by a father in Right and Wrong by Maria Budden. Here, in the course of a family discussion on the pleasures of keeping the Sabbath, the "attentive husband" said:

> "You have left me...to name one other Sunday blessing; the noblest of all"..."I understand you papa," said Agnes; "you mean the satisfaction of going to church" ...."You are right, Agnes; for, what can be a nobler employment than to offer, to the Great Giver of God, the thanksgiving of our grateful hearts, to appear in his more immediate presence, and in his own temple, confess our frailties, entreat his mercy, and adore his power? Oh, my children! What a blessing this is, what a high, what a glorious privilege!"...
> The little circle listened with reverence to this affecting appeal. Their worthy father continued, "How soothing to the best affections, to behold our fellow-creatures joining with us in this sacred act of piety, to look around us and view a whole kneeling congregation; one great family, acknowledging their Universal Father! Who can so feel and leave the house of God with any other feelings that those of pious awe and unbounded charity?"
> The tolling bell now proclaimed the hour of worship--the smiling family with eager haste, prepared to obey the welcome summons; the little ones walked before, the grateful parents followed, their hearts swelling with unutterable content.[86]

Similarly, Mrs. Sherwood wrote that "of all the days in the week, Sunday was the day the /Fairchild/ children loved best"

> for in this day there was no worldy business--no care about money, or clothes, or cooking dinner; no work to be done, but God's work, the sweetest of all works, the work which angels delight to do.[87]

Included in the day's work was Sunday worship for which a great deal of advance preparation was required:

> On Saturday, Betty always made a fruit pie and baked it, and roasted a fowl or a joint of meat, to be cold for the next day, so that she might have nothing to do, when she came from church on Sunday, but to boil a few potatoes. On the Saturday evening also she cleaned the house. And Emily and Lucy used to rub the chairs and tables and do such other little things as they could, to help Betty. They next looked out their own clothes and Henry's for the next day, and laid them on chairs near their beds. Their mamma then gave them complete washing and combing: after which they packed up in their little baskets their Bibles and Prayer-books, and such little presents as they might have been able to get together during the week for the children of the school....On the Sunday morning, the family generally rose a little earlier than usual, that everything that was necessary might be finished before breakfast....and after breakfast all the family made haste to dress themselves; and having made up the fire and locked the doors, they used to set off to the village; for the schools and the church were in the village.--Many pleasant walks had Mr. Fairchild and his family, on a summer's morning, to the village church; Henry, Lucy, and Emily walking quietly first (for they were not allowed to run on a Sunday), Mr. and Mrs. Fairchild coming up next, and Betty and John behind.--Mrs. Barker's neat little house was just at the entrance of the village; the very first house after John Trueman's, and unless something very peculiar happened, Mrs. Barker was always ready to come out, and go with Mrs. Fairchild to the school.[88]

Both the Fairchild family and the family in Right and Wrong normally returned to church in the evening, a practice not uncommon among Evangelical families. On winter evenings, however, when there was no service, or on days when the weather was particularly inclement, Mr. Fairchild conducted his own service with his family, servants, and two elderly neighbors in attendance.[89] Community worship, even when it was so restricted, was highly valued.

3. Attitudes Toward Other Religious Denominations

Given that most books and stories expressed sentiments that were best described as Christian rather than specific to any one denomination, it is not surprising that there was very little information pertaining to religious tolerance or the lack of it in the literature.

Only 4 families could be described with any degree of certainty as tolerant. One of these families, that presented in The Good Grandmother and Her Offspring by Barbara Hofland, has been noted above. More Minor Morals was also noted for its expression of religious tolerance. The minor morals in this book were taught by a maiden aunt, "Mrs. Eleanor," who came to live with her brother and care for his children after his wife's death. Mrs. Eleanor, a cheerful, vigorous, broad-minded woman, lead conversations dealing with a great variety of subjects, including not only religious intolerance but also racial prejudice, card playing, and Sunday observance.

Two families were considered intolerant of other religious denominations. Both families were created by Mrs. Sherwood, and both demonstrated extreme animosity for the Roman Catholic faith. The religious intolerance expressed in The History of Henry Milner came forth in the incident of the poor Irish boy. Mr. Dalben and Henry decided to take the boy, Maurice, into the household, but Maurice, as noted previously, was described as standing "convicted of the crime of being as dirty as Irish habits, united with extreme poverty and long neglect could possibly render him."[90] It was made clear that the boy's Roman Catholicism was a part of those unfortunate "Irish habits." Criticism of Roman Catholicism was more pronounced in The History of the Fairchild Family. Unfortunately, many passages revealed a profound misunderstanding of the faith. The subject was introduced when Henry discovered the term in his book, "THE ACCOUNT OF A LITTLE BOY, WHO, THROUGH GOD'S GRACE, TURNED HIS PARENTS TO RIGHTEOUSNESS":

> "Roman Catholic!" said Henry, shutting his book. "Mamma, I don't know what Roman Catholics are. Are Roman Catholics Christians?"
> "The Roman Catholics, my dear, are called Christians," said Mrs. Fairchild: "but there is much in their religion which we do not approve. The Roman Catholics have a bishop--the Bishop of Rome--(whom they call the Pope, and also the Vicar of Christ, that is, standing in the place of Christ, and almost as great as Christ); and they say that they must do everything that this Pope bids them. They do not believe, as we do, that men's hearts are so evil that they can do nothing meritous; but they say that saints and holy men can do as many good works as will satisfy the demands of God's law for themselves, and leave some to spare to make up for the deficiency of their neighbours."
> "If people can save themselves and their neighbours by their own goodness, Mamma," said Lucy, "what was the use of the Lord Jesus Christ's coming down from heaven, and dying for us?"
> "True, my dear," said Mrs. Fairchild: "all true religion turns upon this,--that we poor creatures are so very bad, that we can do nothing to save ourselves; and that we must entirely trust to our dying Redeemer for salvation. But the Roman Catholics (or, more properly, the Papists) have many persons and ceremonies in which they trust besides Christ. They make images of saints and holy men, and worship them; and they keep long fasts and painful journeys to the graves of saints; thinking by all these things to save themselves."

Criticism of the Roman Catholics continued when the name of another religious group, the Waldenses, was introduced in Henry's book:

> "What are Waldenses, Mamma?" said Henry.
> "Why, my dear," answered Mrs. Fairchild, "many hundred years ago, when all the nations of Europe began to corrupt themselves, by worshipping images of saints, obeying the Pope, and following the Roman Catholic doctrine, a certain set of persons retired from the sight of the rest of mankind, and hid themselves in valleys amongst hills: there they led innocent and holy lives

> for many ages, serving their God in purity and resisting all the wicked desires of the Roman Catholics, who wished to turn them to their own corrupt religion.[92]

The central figure in Henry's book was a little boy named Henrie who, although born of noble Roman Catholic parents, was brought up humbly among the Waldenses. The boy's parents cared little for the boy because he was sickly, and lavished all their affection on their eldest son. When this son died, however, they sent for Henrie. Eventually Henrie, who had learned his lessons well, managed to turn his worldly parents to righteousness, that is, the right faith.

Two families appeared to be indifferent about other religious denominations rather than tolerant or intolerant. Although there were opportunities for expressions of animosity toward French Roman Catholics in Grace Kennedy's book, Anna Ross, because the story took place at the time of the Battle of Waterloo, and in fact, part of the story was set near the battle field, no such religious intolerance appeared. Indifference also appeared in Mrs. Sherwood's The History of Little Henry and His Bearer with one qualification. Heathen religions were not tolerated, but then in the nineteenth century, it would be the rare Christian author indeed who could have accepted non-Christians.

Lucy Newton presented example of a family in which both tolerance and intolerance were expressed. In the book, two well-meaning maiden ladies adopted Lucy, a motherless girl, intending to raise her as a good Christian. The two sisters' methods were very dissimilar. One had a very narrow restrictive view of Christianity, while her sister was far more broadminded and tolerant of religious differences. Needless to say, the "experiment in education," as the book was subtitled, was not particularly successful.

In the remaining books and stories, there was insufficient evidence of religious tolerance, intolerance, or even indifference. As noted above, this is not surprising given the emphasis on Christian faith rather than denominationalism in the literature.

Because there was so little evidence of religious tolerance or intolerance in the literature, social class relationships appeared to be unimportant. And one cannot say whether or not religious tolerance, intolerance or indifference contributed to community solidarity or strengthened community relationships.

V. Conclusion

However forcefully historians of the family argue that the family since the eighteenth century has been engaged in a battle to push back society, to "seal" itself off, to "protect" itself "with privacy and isolation from outside intrusion," to create a fortress, a refuge from society, it must be seen from the evidence presented in this chapter that very little support can be found for this argument in pre-Victorian didactic children's literature. While the more frivolous kinds of social activities were frowned upon by the didactic authors, many other forms of social interaction were encouraged. When these various forms of social interaction were averaged, it was found that 99 out of 119 families had at least a moderate degree of contact with the community. In other words, the majority of families were in regular if not frequent contact with other members of the community. Frequency of contact could be measured on a relative basis only, for stories varied in length, structure, content, and focus. Each story had to be considered individually, and frequency or degree of contact had to be measured against other elements in the story. What might be considered frequent contact in one book might be considered moderate or infrequent in another.

Four fictional families were considered to have an overall high degree of contact with the community. These families were presented as worldly and frivolous. They engaged extensively in the numerous social activites disapproved of by the moralists. They played cards, danced, gambled, and partied. The best example of such a family was the Danvers family in Mrs. Cameron's book, The Fruits of Education.

Only 6 families had little contact with the community. The primary causes for such a low level of interaction were extreme poverty and physical isolation as in Mary Elliot's book, The Orphan Brothers, or Mrs. Sherwood's books, The Happy Family (1838), A Mother's Duty (1820), and The Little Woodman and His Dog Caesar. In only 10 situations was there insufficient information to determine the degree of household contact.

Social class appeared to have little to do with the degree of interaction between the family, the household, and the community. The three social classes were fairly represented in the largest category, the moderate degree of contact, and the figures for high and low degrees of contact were too small to allow any representation.

There was a relationship between the degree of household interaction with the community and the kind of reputation the family enjoyed. Predictably, the majority of families, 92, were considered to have an average reputation. That is, they were generally well thought of, respected, and considered good neighbors.

Thirteen families were considered to have a high reputation in the community. Such a family was presented in Maria Budden's book, Always Happy!!! The father of the family was particularly well thought of. About him the author wrote:

> The father of Felix was not rich, but he was contented with what he had.--His name was not graced with any title of nobility, he was neither a lord nor a duke. He was simply an honest man, a title self-earned, and placing its possessor amongst all good men. He was compassionate, he was pious, and all his neighbours loved and respected him.[93]

The social class relationship here is interesting if not significant. One family was a member of the upper class, 7 were middle class, and 5 were lower class.

Five families had a low reputation in the community. Interestingly, 3 of the families with a low reputation were upper class families and 2 were lower class. The so-called "respectable middle class" was indeed true to its name. It must be noted that two of these families with low reputations also had very little to do with community activities of any sort.

For 8 families there was insufficient information in the story to determine the nature of the family's reputation in the community. In one book, The History of Isaac Jenkins by Thomas Beddoes, the family's reputation underwent a profound change in the course of the story. Isaac Jenkins, a wretched, slovenly drunkard, became a sober, respectable citizen by the end of the book. Needless to say, his much abused wife and children profited by this change.

Because the majority of fictional families had at least a moderate degree of contact with the community, and enjoyed a moderate to high reputation in the community, the image of the family and community relationships presented in pre-Victorian didactic children's literature is not consistent with Ariès conclusion that "sociability and the concept of the family were incompatible, and could only develop at each other's expense," or Shorter's argument that "domesticity ...sealed off the family as a whole from its traditional interaction with the surrounding world," placed the family in "physical and spiritual isolation," and promoted "the abandonment of a meaningful emotional life outside the home." Similarly, the literature lends little support to Richard Sennett's forceful statement in The Fall of Public Man, a study of the social psychology of capitalism:

> The traumas of 19th century capitalism led those who had the means to try to shield themselves in whatever way possible from the shocks of an economic order which neither victors nor victims understood. Gradually the will to control and shape the public order eroded, and people put more emphasis on protecting themselves from it. The family became one of these shields. During the 19th century the family came to appear less and less the center of a particular, non-public region, more a idealized refuge, a world all its own, with a higher moral value than the public realm. The bourgeois family was idealized as life wherein order and authority were unchallenged, security of material existence could be a concomitant of real marital love, and the transactions between members of the family would brook no outside scrutiny. As the family became a refuge from the terrors of society, it gradually became also a moral yardstick with which to measure the public realm....Using family relations as a standard, people perceived the public domain not as a limited set of social relations, as in the Enlightenment, but instead saw public life as morally inferior. Privacy and stability appeared to be united in the family; against this ideal order the legitimacy of the public order was thrown into question.[94]

In fiction, as well as in real life, the nineteenth century family was idealized and internal relationships were intense. The family was, as Sennett states, an institution in which order and authority were highly respected and probably unchallenged. The evidence presented in the previous chapter clearly supports this part of Sennett's argument. But there is no support in didactic children's literature for his statement that the family became a refuge from the terrors of society. One must turn to writers like John Ruskin for such support. The communities represented in The History of the Fairchild Family, Fabulous Histories, Always Happy!!! and the other books and stories examined here held no real terrors whatever unpleasant incidents might have occurred in the books themselves. While family life held a central place, social and community responsibilities were also important. Few fictional families indeed cut themselves off from the community and significantly, those that did were not presented in a particularly favorable light.

NOTES

[1] Philippe Ariès, Centuries of Childhood. A Social History of Family Life (New York: Vintage Books, 1965) p. 405.

[2] Ibid., pp. 398, 405 - 406.

[3] Ibid., p. 406.

[4] Ibid., pp. 406 - 407.

[5] "The Decline of Kinship, Clientage and Community," chapter 4 of The Family, Sex and Marriage in England 1500 - 1800 (New York: Harper and Row, 1977), pp. 123 - 150.

[6] Stone is particularly concerned here about the position of the mistreated wife who increasingly lost kin and community support and protection.

[7] Stone, op. cit., p. 660.

[8] Edward Shorter, The Making of the Modern Family (New York: Basic Books, 1977), pp. 53, 227 - 228.

[9] Ibid., pp. 244, 254.

[10] Mary Martha Sherwood, The Little Woodman and His Dog Caesar, twelfth edition (Wellington, Salop.: printed by and for F. Houlston and Son, 1828), pp. 3 - 6.

[11] Ibid., p. 16.

[12] -------, The History of the Fairchild Family; or the children's manual; being a collection of stories calculated to shew the importance and effects of religious education (London: J. Hatchard and Son, 1818), p. 1.

[13] Ibid., p. 2.

[14] Ibid., p. 153.

[15] According to the catalogue of the Osborne Collection, Sullivan translated this book from the French. However, an unsigned note discovered in the book stated, "Sullivan was in fact the author of this book and in calling himself the translator, he was trying to exploit the current fashion for French children's books." The source of this interesting bit of information is unknown. The information may well be true, for Sullivan did actually write at least three books which are now in the Osborne Collection.

[16] The History of Little Goody Two-Shoes taken from From Instruction to Delight. An Anthology of Children's Literature to 1850, edited by Patricia Demers and Gordon Moyles (Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1982), pp. 117 - 118. The selections in this anthology are taken from the Osborne Collection. Because I have examined The History of Goody Two-Shoes myself (it is number 42 in my list of 100 titles), I did not hesitate to quote this passage. From Instruction to Delight was published some months after I had completed my research.

[17] Sherwood, Fairchild Family, p. 1.

[18] Ibid., p. 162.

[19] Sherwood, The Little Woodman, p. 6.

[20] Ariès, op. cit., p. 72.

[21] Ibid., pp. 72 - 73.

[22] A phrase used in the catalogue in the description of the book.

[23] Lucy Lyttelton Cameron, The Two Mothers; or, memoirs of the last century (Wellington, Salop.: printed by and for F. Houlston and Son, London, 1824), p. 66.

[24] Ibid., p. 61.

[25] Sarah Trimmer, Fabulous Histories, designed for the instruction of children respecting their treatment of animals (Dublin: Printed for Messers W. Watson, Collis, Wilson, Wogen, White, Byrne, Cash, Marchbank, W. Porter, M'Kenzie Jones and More, 1786), p. 101. Many editions were published throughout the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. It was eventually published as Fabulous Histories or The History of the Robins (London: N. Hailes, 1818).

[26] Ibid., p. 107.

[27] The Factory Girl (London and Wellington, Salop: Printed for Houlston and Son, 1831), pp. 75 - 79.

[28] Canon Charles Smith quoted in The Victorian Frame of Mind, 1830 - 1870 (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1975), pp. 219 - 220.

[29] J. F. C. Harrison, Early Victorian Britain 1832 - 51 (Fontana Books, 1979), p. 161.

[30] Houghton, op. cit., p. 222.

[31] Ibid., pp. 245 - 246.

[32] The Advantages of Education Elucidated, in the history of the Wingfield family (London: printed for J. Harris and Son, 1819), pp. 52 - 54.

[33] Sherwood, Fairchild Family, p. 8.

[34] Ibid., p. 9.

[35] Dicken presents an outrageous picture of such "total participation" in Bleak House (1853):

> Among the ladies who were most distinguished for... rapacious benevolence (if I may use the expression), was a Mrs. Pardiggle....She was a formidable style of lady, with spectacles, a prominent nose, and a loud voice, who had the effect of wanting a great deal of room. And she really did, for she knocked down little chairs with her skirts that were quite a great way off. As only Ada and I were at home, we received her timidly; for she seemed to come in like cold weather, and to make the little Pardiggles blue as they followed.
> "These, young ladies," said Mrs. Pardiggle, with great volubility, after the first salutations, "are my five boys. You may have seen their names in a printed subscription list (perhaps more than one), in the possession of our esteemed friend, Mr. Jarndyce. Egbert, my eldest (twelve), is the boy who sent out his pocket-money, to the amount of five-and-threepence, to the Tockahoopo Indians. Oswald, my second (ten-and-a-half), is the child who contributed two-and-ninepence to the Great National Smithers Testimonial. Francis, my third (nine), one-and-sixpence-halfpenny; Felix, my fourth (seven), eightpence to the Superannuated Widows; Alfred, my youngest (five), has voluntarily enrolled himself in the Infant Bonds of Joy, and is pledged never, through life, to use tobacco in any form."
> We had never seen such dissatisfied children. It was not merely that they were weazen and shrivelled--though they were certainly that too--but they looked absolutely ferocious with discontent. At the mention of the Tockahoopo Indians, I could really have supposed Egbert to be one of the most baleful members of that tribe, he gave me such a savage frown. The face of each child, as the amount of his contribution was mentioned, darkened in a peculiarly vindictive manner, but his was by far the worst. I must except, however, the little recruit into the Infant Bonds of Joy, who was stolidly and evenly miserable.
> "You have been visiting, I understand," said Mrs. Pardiggle, "at Mrs. Jellyby's?"
> We said yes, we had passed one night there.

"Mrs. Jellyby," pursued the lady, always speaking in the same demonstrative, loud, hard tone, so that her voice impressed my fancy as if it had a sort of spectacles on too--and I may take the opportunity of remarking that her spectacles were made the less engaging by her eyes being what Ada called "choking eyes," meaning very prominent: "Mrs. Jellyby is a benefactor to society, and deserves a helping hand. My boys have contributed to the African project--Egbert, one-and-six, being the entire allowance of nine weeks; Oswald, one-and-a-penny-halfpenny, being the same; the rest, according to their little means. Nevertheless, I do not go with Mrs. Jellyby in all things. I do not go with Mrs. Jellyby in her treatment of her young family. It has been noticed. It has been observed that her young family are excluded from participation in the objects to which she is devoted. She may be right, she may be wrong; but right or wrong, this is not my course with my young family. I take them everywhere."

I was afterwards convinced (and so was Ada) that from the ill-conditioned eldest child, these words extorted a sharp yell. He turned it off into a yawn, but it began as a yell.

"They attend Matins with me (very prettily done), at half-past six o'clock in the morning all the year round, including of course the depth of winter," said Mrs. Pardiggle rapidly, "and they are with me during the revolving duties of the day. I am a School lady, I am a Visiting lady, I am a Reading lady, I am a Distributing lady; I am on the local Linen Box Committee, and many general Committees; and my canvassing alone is very extensive--perhaps no one's more so. But they are my companions everywhere; and by these means they acquire that knowledge of the poor, and that capacity of doing charitable business in general--in short, the taste for the sort of thing which will render them in after life a service to their neighbours, and a satisfaction to themselves. My young family are not frivolous; they expend the entire amount of their allowance, in subscriptions, under my direction; and they have attended as many public meetings, and listened to as many lectures, orations, and discussions, as generally fall to the lot of few grown people. Alfred (five), who, as I mentioned, has of his own election joined the Infant Bonds of Joy, was one of the very few children who manifested consciousness on that occasion, after a fervid address of two hours from the chairman of the evening."

Alfred glowered at us as if he never could, or would, forgive the injury of that night.

"You may have observed, Miss Summerson," said Mrs. Pardiggle, "in some of the lists to which I have referred, in the possession of our esteemed friend

Mr. Jarndyce, that the names of my young family are concluded with the name of O. A. Pardiggle, F. R. S., one pound. That is their father. We usually observe the same routine. I put down my mite first; then my young family enroll their contributions, according to their ages and their little means; and then Mr. Pardiggle brings up the rear. Mr. Pardiggle is happy to throw in his limited donation, under my direction; and thus things are made, not only pleasant to ourselves, but, we trust, improving to others." Charles Dickens, Bleak House (New York: W. W. Norton, 1977), pp. 93 - 95.

[36] Sherwood, Fairchild Family, p. 2.

[37] Mary Martha Sherwood, Soffrona and Her Cat Muff (Wellington, Salop: Printed by and for Houlston and Son, London, 1828), pp. 16 - 17.

[38] -------, Fairchild Family, p. 2.

[39] Department of English, The University of Calgary, Selections From Children's Literature in England 1200 - 1900 (n.d.), p. 28. This phrase is taken from the same edition of The History of Goody Two-Shoes (1765) used in From Instruction to Delight (see note 16 above). The passages selected for these two anthologies differ, and this particular phrase does not appear in From Instruction to Delight. I have used this phrase from Selections for the same reason given above for the other anthology--I have examined Goody Two-Shoes (in this edition and in later editions in particular the 1815 and 1830 editions) myself in the Osborne collection.

[40] Trimmer, Fabulous Histories, pp. 110 - 111.

[41] Ibid., p. 112.

[42] Ibid., pp. 121 - 122.

[43] See data presented in Chapter II.

[44] Harrison, op. cit., p. 161.

[45] Houghton, op. cit., p. 55.

[46] Ibid.

[47] E. P. Thompson, The Making of the English Working Class (Penguin Books, 1976) pp. 60 - 61.

[48] Raymond Williams, Culture and Society 1780 - 1950 (Penguin Books, 1977), p. 23.

[49] Edmund Burke, Reflections on the Revolution in France, (Indianapolis, Ind.,: Bobbs-Merrill, 1955), pp. xxiv-v. The complete quotation reads as follows:

> Society is indeed a contract. Subordinate contracts for objects of mere occasional interest may be dissolved at pleasure--but the state ought not to be considered as nothing better than a partnership agreement in a trade of pepper and coffee, calico, or tobacco, or some other such low concern, to be taken up for a little temporary interest, and to be dissolved by the fancy of the parties. It is to be looked upon with other reverence; because it is not a partnership in things subservient only to the gross animal existence of a temporary and perishable nature. It is a partnership in all art; a partnership in every virtue, and all perfection. As the ends of such a partnership cannot be obtained in many generations, it becomes a partnership not only between those who are living, but between those who are dead, and those who are to be born. Each contract of each particular state is but a clause in the great primeval contract of eternal society, linking the lower with the higher natures, connecting the visible and invisible world, according to a fixed compact sanctioned by the inviolable oath which holds all physical and moral natures, each in their appointed place.

[50] Burke has been called a "champion of the status quo," an "ultra-conservative," "the unrelenting champion of the old order," and although these epithets are not undeserved, they do not do real justice to the man. It is true that Burke believed that society was in fact divinely ordered, that the great noble families of England should rule as trustees for the nation, but it is not true to say that Burke did not believe in reform, that he adhered unflinchingly to the status quo:

> A man full of warm, speculative benevolence may wish his society otherwise constituted than he finds it; but a good patriot, and a true politician, always considers how he shall make the most of the existing materials of his country. A disposition to preserve, and an ability to improve, taken together, would be my standard of a statesman. Everything else is vulgar in the conception, perilous in the extreme.
>
> At once to preserve and to reform is quite another thing. When the useful parts of an old establishment are kept, and what is superadded is to be fitted to what is retained, a vigorous mind, steady, persevering attention, various powers of comparison and combination, and the resources of an understanding fruitful in expedients, are to be exercised; they are to be exercised in a continued conflict with the combined force of opposite vices, with the obstinacy that regrets all improvement, and the levity that is fatigued and disgusted with everything of which it is in possession.

> But you may object--"a process of this kind is slow. It is not fit for an assembly which glories in performing in a few months the work of ages. Such a mode of reforming, possibly, might take up many years." Without question it might; and it ought. It is one of the excellences of a method in which time is among the assistants, that its operation is slow and in some cases almost imperceptible. If circumspection and caution are a part of wisdom, when we work only upon inanimate matters, surely they become a part of duty too, when the subject of our demolition and construction is not brick and timber, but sentient beings, by the sudden alteration of whose state, condition, and habits, multitudes may be rendered miserable. (p. xxiii)

[51] Williams, op. cit., p. 92. Carlyle argued at one point:

> Surely of all 'rights of man' this right of the ignorant man to be guided by the wiser, to be, gently or forcibly, held in the true course by him, is the indisputablest. Nature herself ordains it from the first; society struggles towards perfection by enforcing and accomplishing it more and more. If Freedom have any meaning, it means enjoyment of this right, wherein all other rights are enjoyed. (Williams, p. 93)

[52] Behold...this England of the Year 1200 was...a green solid place, that grew corn and several other things. The Sun shone on it; and vicissitude of seasons and human fortunes. Cloth was woven and worn; ditches were dug, furrow-fields ploughed, and houses built. Day by day all men and cattle rose to labour, and night by night returned home weary to their several lairs. In wondrous Dualism, then as now, lived nations of breathing men; alternating in all ways, between Light and Dark; between joy and sorrow, between rest and toil,--between hope, hope reaching high as Heaven, and fear deep as very Hell....(p. 43)
Truly we cannot enough admire in those Abbot-Samson and William Conqueror times, the arrangement they made of their Governing Classes. Highly interesting to observe how the sincere insight, on their part, into what they did, of primary necessity, behove to be accomplished, had led them to the way of accomplishing it, and in the course of time to get it accomplished.... (p. 235)
It was a Land Aristocracy; it managed the Governing of this English People, and had the reaping of the Soil of England in return. It is, in many senses, the law of nature, this same Law of Feudalism....(Thomas Carlyle, Past and Present (London: Dent, 1970), p. 235).

[53] Carlyle, Past and Present, p. 235.

[54] The Advantages of Education Elucidated, pp. 52 - 54.

[55] Mary Elliot, The Two Edwards; or, pride and prejudice unmasked (London: William Darton, 1823) p. 51.

[56] Ibid., pp. 74 - 75.

[57] Ibid., pp. 135 - 136.

[58] Ibid., p. 179.

[59] Mary Martha Sherwood, The History of Henry Milner, a little boy who was not brought up according to the fashions of this world, fifth edition (London: J. Hatchard and Son, 1835), pp. 207 - 208.

[60] Ibid., p. 211.

[61] Ibid., p. 213.

[62] Ibid., p. 216.

[63] Frances Jamieson, Ashford Rectory; or, the spoiled child reformed (London: printed for G. and W. B. Whittaker and N. Hailes, 1820), p. 16.

[64] Thomas Beddoes, The History of Isaac Jenkins....(Dublin: printed by R. D. Webb, 1831), p. 40.

[65] Ibid., p. 37.

[66] Hannah More, The Good Mother's Legacy (London: sold by J. E. Evans and also J. Hatchard and Son, J. Nisbet /ca. 1830/), p. 4.

[67] Elliot, Mary, Idle Ann, or, the dunce reclaimed (London: William Darton /ca. 1820/), pp. 30 - 31.

[68] Hannah More, The Shepherd of Salisbury Plain (London: sold by J. E. Evans, sold also by J. Hatchard and Son, J. Nisber; and A. E. Bins, Bath /ca. 1830/. First published in 1795), p. 4.

[69] Sherwood, The History of the Fairchild Family, pp. 91 - 92.

[70] Ibid., pp. 154 - 155.

[71] Ibid., p. 110.

[72] Ibid., p. 112.

[73] Marion Lockhead, The Victorian Household (London: John Murray, 1964), p. 30.

[74] Mrs. Sherwood's books are something of an exception. As many of her child characters appear to be more "rounded" than those of many of her contemporaries, so some of her servant characters are given more personality. There are some lively exchanges between servants and willful children in The History of the Fairchild Family, The History of Henry Milner, and Soffrona and her Cat Muff, to name three examples in addition to The History of Little Henry and his Bearer.

[75] Harrison, op. cit., p. 165.

[76] It will be recalled from Chapter III that 39 out of 119 families employed at least a nurse, a tutor, or a governess. Those children who received some instruction from a governess or a tutor would have been at least upper-middle class.

[77] See Harrison, op. cit., pp. 165 - 166.

[78] Richard D. Altick, Victorian People and Ideas (New York: W. W. Norton, 1973), p. 55.

[79] Ibid.

[80] Edmund Gosse, Father and Son (Penguin Books, 1973), p. 57.

[81] Ibid., p. 62.

[82] Sherwood, Fairchild Family, pp. 101 - 102.

[83] What Trade Shall I Be? (London: Edward Lacy /ca. 1830/), p. 5.

[84] Barbara Hofland, The Good Grandmother and her Offspring; a tale (London: Printed for R. Hunter, 1817), p. 67.

[85] William Francis Sullivan--see note 15.

[86] /Maria Budden/ Right and Wrong, Exhibited in the history of Rosa and Agnes (London: Printed for J. Harris, 1815), pp. 168 - 170.

[87] Sherwood, Fairchild Family, p. 112.

[88] Ibid., pp. 109 - 110.

[89] Ibid., p. 112.

[90] Sherwood, Henry Milner, p. 211.

[91] Sherwood, Fairchild Family, pp. 197 - 198.

[92] Ibid., pp. 198 - 199.

[93] Budden, Always Happy!!!, pp. 1 - 2.

[94] Richard Sennett, The Fall of Public Man. On the Social Psychology of Capitalism (New York: Vintage Books, 1978), pp. 19 - 20.

CHAPTER V

EDUCATION AND RECREATION

CHAPTER V

EDUCATION AND RECREATION

I. Introduction

Education and recreation, the final subjects to be examined in this study, bring together many points discussed in earlier chapters. In educational theory and practice and in recreational activities it is possible to see attitudes toward childhood, the family, and the community at work. Social, moral, and religious concerns have shaped patterns of education and recreation. It is not surprising that didactic authors of children's literature found education and recreation important subjects. These subjects added interest and authenticity to their stories and were areas worthy of social and moral comment.

Although it is the image rather than the reality of the family, education, and recreation that will be the focus of discussion here, the reality cannot help but be reflected to some extent in the expression of educational theory and practice and recreational activities in the literature. Knowing that the nineteenth century was a period of social and economic ferment that had profound effects on traditional forms of education and recreation, one might wish for rather more reflection of reality in the literature than can be found. But it must be recalled that nineteenth century didactic authors were essentially conservative and anxious to present an image of an ideal way of life.

The chapter will be divided into two main parts. In the first part, education, educational orientation, location and type of schooling, curriculum and method will be discussed. In the second part, recreation, topics will include the location of children's play, adult involvement in and supervision of children's play, the recreational activities and reading material of both children and adults.

As it should be seen, education and recreation are not necessarily mutually exclusive topics. Reading, for example, can be discussed in terms of both education and recreation. And because of social class associations, the type of schooling a child experiences too may affect his recreational interests and activities. The pre-Victorians had less difficulty than may be expected in combining education and recreation. They had a passion for useful knowledge, educational games, and creative play. Moral earnestness characterized both their education and recreation.

II. Education

1. Introduction

The history of education since the Middle Ages has been dependent on the gradual recognition of what Philippe Ariès refers to as "the special characteristics of childhood."[1] It is no coincidence that the history of educational thought and practice closely parallels developments in concepts of childhood and the family. Until it was recognized that childhood is a stage of life, important in itself and not merely a rather inconvenient time of life which must be suffered before that more important stage of life, adulthood; that children's needs and abilities are not those of adults; that children are vulnerable, dependent and in need of nurture and protection; there will be no special educational provisions for them. As Ariès writes in the longest and most important section of his book, "The Scholastic Life," education in the past, before the discovery of childhood, was distinguished by certain features:

> the lack of gradation in the curriculum according to difficulty of subject-matter, the simultaneity with which the subjects were taught, the mixing of ages, and the liberty of the pupils.[2]

Clearly, there was no recognition in educational thought and practice of the special characteristics of childhood.

The late seventeenth and eighteenth centuries may be considered a watershed in the development of a concept of childhood. It is significant that the educational ideas of Locke and Rousseau gained popularity and influence at this time. The seventeenth and eighteenth centuries too saw appearance of "two phenomena," to quote Ariès, which were to characterize educational thought and practice in Europe throughout the nineteenth century:

> first, in the seventeenth century, the demographic specialization of the ages from five-to-seven to ten-to-eleven, both in the little schools and in the lower classes of the colleges;[3] then, in the eighteenth century, the specialization of two types of education, one for the lower classes, the other for the middle classes and the aristocracy. On the one hand the

> children were separated from their elders, on the other hand the children were separated from the poor.[4]

2. The Age Lessons Begin

Ariès states that by the seventeenth century, the age at which children began their schooling was about five years old. It is unlikely that Ariès would disagree that five can only be regarded as an approximate age. In England, at any rate, it was not until the latter part of the nineteenth century that an age for beginning school was proclaimed by law.[5] Although the majority of didactic authors provided very little information on this subject, the average age at which lessons began, where it could be determined, was 5.36 years for boys and 5.94 years for girls.[6] Lessons were defined as organized, regular instruction in one or more of the following subjects: reading, writing, classics, science, mathematics, modern languages, history, geography, religion and "accomplishments." These subjects will be discussed at length at a later point. Instruction did not have to take place in a formal environment. Parents, older siblings, relatives and friends could give the lessons as well as a recognized teacher.

The youngest age at which boys began their lessons was 2 years old. Little Frank in The History of Little Frank and his Sister by Mrs. Cameron began his lessons at this tender age. Admittedly, it was religious instruction of a very elementary nature given by the boy's elder sister Sophia. Sophia's kindness and devotion to her brother in this matter was in fact the focus of the story. Even though Mrs. Cameron's book was the only example in the didactic children's literature examined of lessons begun at such an early age, it was probably not uncommon, in fact, particularly in very religious families. In A Token for Children James Janeway provided an example "Of a Child that was admirably affected with the Things of God, when he was between two or three years old: With a brief Account of his Death."[7] For this child to have been so admirably affected, it would have been necessary for him to have had religious instruction at a very early age indeed.

Examples of lessons begun at a very early age can be found in adult literature. In The Way of All Flesh, Samuel Butler wrote that his hero, Ernest Pontifex, "could read and, after a fashion, write" before he was three years old. Moreover, before the boy was four, "he was learning Latin and could do the rule of three sums."[8] Butler's example is a parody of Evangelical child-rearing practices it is true, but on a more serious note is John Stuart Mill's statement in his Autobiography that he began to learn Greek at three years old.[9]

The oldest age at which lessons began for boys in the literature was 7 years old and occurred in A Mother's Duty by Mrs. Sherwood. The instruction was primarily religious. A gentleman persuaded a poor woman that it was her duty to teach her son to read the Bible. The boy's religious education had been neglected, sorely so, by Evangelical standards.

With respect to the education of girls, the earliest age at which lessons began was 4 years old. This occurred in The Warren Family by S. W. where lessons consisted not only of religious instruction but also reading, writing, arithmetic, some geography, and "accomplishments" such as drawing and needlework.

The oldest age at which lessons began for girls was 12 years old. This was the case in The Little Cowslip Gatherers by Esther Copley, and the delay was due to extreme poverty. A friend became Nancy's tutor, however, and Nancy soon learned how to read. Nancy must have learned writing and arithmetic too, for she eventually opened an account in a savings bank with the pennies she had managed to save from her earnings making bouquets of cowslips. At the end of the book, her account was large enough to buy a respectable trousseau. The book was aptly subtitled, "What a Penny Will Do."

As stated above, boys and girls in the literature began their lessons between 5 and 6 years old. Parents understood the need for a graduated curriculum for children. There was no expectation that children could learn with adults as Ariès states was the case in the past. Mrs. Sherwood described the Fairchild children's curriculum as follows:

> Mr. and Mrs. Fairchild had three children; Lucy, who was about eight years old when these stories began; Emily, who was next in age, and Henry, who was between five and six. These little children never went to school; Mrs. Fairchild taught Lucy and Emily, and Mr. Fairchild taught little Henry. Lucy and Emily learned to read, and to do various kinds of needlework. Lucy had begun to write, and took great pains with her

> writing: Their mamma also taught them to sing psalms and hymns, and they could sing several very sweetly. Little Henry, too, had a great notion of singing.[10]

Henry did not begin his Latin lessons until very late in the book. Up to that point his lessons with his father consisted of "spelling and a verse from the Bible to learn every day."[11] This cannot be considered too strenuous a schedule for a little boy of five or six, for before he began to study Latin, he could learn his lessons and "play with the hare too half the morning."[12]

3. Type and Location of Education

As noted in the previous chapter, economic and social factors played a great part in determining the type of education a child would receive, if indeed he received an education at all. It was not until the latter part of the century that schooling became common for all social classes. Previously, many children, upper class as well as lower class, did not receive any formal education at all. In Early Victorian Britain 1832 - 51, J. F. C. Harrison simplifies and summarizes the state of education as follows:

> The institutions of education were a strange assortment of ancient privelege and recent innovation. For the aristocracy, gentry, and wealthy middle classes the Public Schools provided an education for leadership, which successfully integrated the old and new into a ruling élite. In the cities and market towns the old grammar schools offered a traditional classics-based curriculum for the sons of local tradesmen and businessmen. For the children of the labouring classes three main types of institution existed: the private day school (including the dame school), the Sunday school, and the factory school. The great majority of working class pupils in common day schools were under the age of ten, and many attended for only two or three years. The quality of education in such

> schools was low, for the teachers were unqualified and the charge per head (school pence) was under 6d per week. Dame schools intended for the youngest children, were usually little more than baby-minding establishments. Factory schools, established under the educational clauses of the 1833 Factories Act, were not much better than the private day schools. The Sunday schools which had grown rapidly since their foundation in the 1780's, were handicapped by the part-time basis of their operation, and were perhaps mainly useful in giving able boys a start from which they could go on to educate themselves. Even when the school pence were forthcoming and parents were willing and able to forgo their children's earnings for some years, the restricted curricula and haphazard organization of primary education were such as to provide at best a certain amount of "instruction" and seldom a genuine education.[13]

These social and economic considerations were reflected to some extent in the stories that provided information about schooling. In the following discussion, the location of schooling for boys and girls will be examined separately. Harrison did not note that the sexes did not as a rule receive the same or even an equal education. It must be noted that in all cases, the location of schooling refers to the place a child received his education during the greater or most important part of the book or story.

Thirty-five out of 119 fictional families provided education for their sons at home. This education was given by one or both parents, a governess or a tutor.[14] Many boys received their elementary instruction from their fathers in preparation for higher education outside the community. Henry Fairchild, who was "between five and six" when the story opened, received his first lessons from his father. Although Henry never left the community for his schooling in the course of the story, undoubtedly he would some day, for near the end of the book, Mrs. Sherwood began the account of that very unpleasant episode in the life of little Henry as follows:

> About this time Mr. Fairchild thought it proper to begin to teach Henry Latin. Latin is a very difficult language, and it requires many hours of hard labour before any little boy can master it: but is necessary for every boy to learn who is to become a clergyman, such knowledge being required of a young man before he is ordained. Mr. Fairchild wished to bring up Henry to be a clergyman, and it was Henry's own wish also.[15]

As noted above, before Henry began his course of Latin studies, his lessons with his father consisted of "spelling and a verse from the Bible to learn every day."

Like Mr. Fairchild, Mr. Hervey in Education at Home by Edgar White Benson also instructed his sons at home. Mr. Hervey could have educated his sons more expensively for he had the financial means to do so. However, as the author wrote, Mr. Hervey believed that

> in the education of his children, he was contributing in a greater degree to their future happiness, than by accumulating wealth and leaving their minds to be trained by dependents. In dedicating much of his time to their instruction Mr. Hervey felt himself amply repaid by their increased attachment.[16]

The author did not indicate that the boys would receive more formal education at a later time. It would not have been inconceivable to the nineteenth century reader that the boys could receive all their education from their father. John Stuart Mill received no formal education.[17] The Hervey and Fairchild families were considered upper and middle class families respectively. If the literature reflects reality to any degree, the elementary education these boys would have received at home would have surpassed what normally would have been available in the community.

Many lower class children in the literature also received their education at home, and although social and economic factors were also at work here, the results naturally were far different. A good number of lower class parents could not afford to send their sons to school, even if instruction was provided without cost through the benevolence of the local gentry or aristocracy. It was necessary for some children to help support the family through their small wages or their physical labor. Such was the case in The History of Margaret Whyte by Mrs. Cameron and The Little Woodman and His Dog Caesar by Mrs. Sherwood. The education or instruction these boys received was practical and rudimentary. They learned something of their fathers' trades--thatching and woodcutting respectively--and received some religious instruction. William, the little woodman, learned to read at home with his grandmother, or so the reader may assume, for near the end of the book Mrs. Sherwood wrote:

> When William grew up he thanked his grandmother for having preserved him from doing wrong. And thus their days were spent happily in diligent labour; while their evenings were closed with reading God's book and praying together, till at length, the pious old woman died.[18]

Very few families sent their sons to community or neighborhood schools. Of the 5 that did, social and economic circumstances were a factor. Three of the families were lower class and 2 were middle class. As may be expected, considering the élite type of education the upper classes desired for their sons, no upper class boys were sent to community or neighborhood schools. The community schools that the lower class children attended were the charity, church, or factory schools described by Harrison. The schools attended by the middle class boys in *Anna Ross* by Grace Kennedy and *The Truant Reclaimed* were a better sort of school.

In 13 families boys were sent out of the community for their schooling or instruction. In this category too, social class played a discernible part. Six of the families were upper class families, 5 were middle class, and only 2 were lower class. Except for the latter families which were presented in the books *The History of Farmer Darwin and His Family* by A. Selwyn and *The History of Little Goody Two-Shoes*, the upper and middle class families sent their sons to boarding schools for a specialized or élite education. In *Nina* by Maria Budden, Nina's brother left the community to receive an education that would prepare him to become a clergyman. In *Improvement* by Diana Bayley, Charles was sent to an expensive boarding school outside London. Similarly in *The Willoughby Family* by Mrs. Cameron, the son was sent to a boarding school. The first two families were considered middle class, the latter upper class. With respect to the lower class families, the sons left their respective communities to take up apprenticeships.

In a number of families, the sons received their education in more than one location and each location was given equal emphasis by the authors. In 4 families sons received their education in the household and the community. Three of these families were middle class and one was lower class. The middle class families were presented in The Two Edwards by Mary Elliot, The Triumph of Good Nature (1815), and The Little Prisoner by Catherine Parr Traill and Susanna Moodie. In The Two Edwards, Edward, a sickly boy, was sent to live with his uncle in the country in the hope that his health and stamina would improve. Edward, who had been instructed in his parents' household, continued his education while living with his uncle. In The Little Prisoner, one of the boys, Ferdinand, was so sickly at birth that he was sent away to be cared for in another household while his mother, not a strong woman herself, devoted her energies to his twin brother. The sort of education Ferdinand actually received was questionable. At any rate, he returned to his parents spoiled, bad-tempered, and passionate. With respect to the lower class family that appeared in The Blind Farmer and His Children by Barbara Hofland, the farmer's son decided to continue his education outside the household by taking employment with an artist.

The sons of 8 families received their education both in the household and outside the community. These families were, with one exception, upper and middle class families. In the case of the lower class family presented in The Scottish Orphans by Isabella Stoddart, the boys in fact were of noble parentage. The boys were unaware of this, however, and lived in humble conditions. Their parents had been supporters of the Stuarts and had met an unfortunate end. One of their father's loyal tenants had rescued the boys just after their father's execution, and brought them to live with his own poor family. The worthy man kept his foster children in ignorance of their true condition for their own protection. Many years later, a gentleman and his wife befriended the family and provided the boys with an education worthy of their real station.

The type of education these middle and upper class boys received outside the community was of course an élite boarding school education. In Always Happy!!! by Maria Budden, a considerable amount of space was devoted to the preparation for Felix's departure for school. His younger sister Serena busily prepared for his future comfort:

> His neat new handkerchiefs were of her hemming, his silk purse she had netted, and with her own hand fresh lined the deal box that was to contain his books.[19]

And his father delivered a bracing speech, reminding the boy of his duty to the honor of his mother and sister. Any dishonor he brought upon himself would reflect on them. Note was also made of Serena's devoted attention to knitting socks for Felix, caring for his garden and his rabbits.

In only one family, the middle class family presented in The History of a Merchant's Widow and Her Young Family by Barbara Hofland (1825) were the sons educated both in the community and outside. In only 1 family too did the boy receive an education in all three locations--the household, the community, and outside the community. The boy, Philip, the central figure in The West Indian (1827), did not have an ordinary family life. Born in Jamaica of middle class English parents, he was orphaned at only six years old. Until a relative in England sent for him, Philip was cared for by a devoted native servant named Caesar, much as little Henry was cared for by Boosy in Mrs. Sherwood's book, The History of Little Henry and His Bearer. Once Philip and Caesar arrived in England, the relative, a gentleman of some means, provided the boy with an education appropriate for his status.

Even though the location of schooling for boys could be determined or was relevant for only 67 families, there was a clearly discernible pattern. The location of schooling for boys was influenced by social and economic factors. Upper and middle class boys by and large received their schooling or education in the household, outside the community at an élite boarding school, or both. Community schools were attended primarily by boys of the lower class. A few middle class boys attended community schools. Some lower class boys went out of the community for their education or apprenticeship.

Although many of the more general comments pertaining to the education of boys were applicable also to the education of girls, there was an important underlying philosophical difference. To quote Richard D. Altick in Victorian People and Ideas:

> "Be good, sweet maid," ran Kingsley's familiar advice, "and let who can be clever." There was something unpleasant, even alarming about strong-willed women who insisted on using their minds. Accordingly, the education which girls of the upper and upper-middle class received from governesses and from visiting language and music teachers was devoid of intellectual content, let alone intellectual challenge. It was limited to the polite accomplishments which were calculated to help her first win a husband and then, after that primary goal was reached, to infuse her household with an air of the softer graces so as to maintain its separation from the gritty world of affairs.[20]

Thus Serena's anxious attention to her brother's welfare just noted in Always Happy!!! was appropriate. Their different "ends" too were appropriate and clearly understandable in their historical context. Felix

> without any remarkable share of ability, engaged assiduously to the profession his father selected for him.--By a course of steady and persevering exertion; he gained an honourable station in life.[21]

Serena, on the other hand, became "the amiable daughter, the affectionate sister--the faithful friend."

> Who directs the household cares, provides the neat, though frugal meal, regulates the duties of the day, and smiles away its cares?--the active, the useful Serena.--Who bends over the sick couch of an aged father, and speaks comfort to an anxious mother's heart--the gentle Serena.[22]

Given this attitude toward the education of girls in the nineteenth century, it is hardly surprising to find that by far the majority of girls in the literature were educated at home. Fifty-two families provided no formal education for their daughters. Although the number of families that provided no formal education for their sons was also large, 35 families, the numerical difference is significant, particularly when it is understood that even though many of those boys did not attend school in the course of the story, there was little doubt that formal education was intended for them. The History of the Fairchild Family provided an excellent example of this difference. At the outset, their education appeared not unequal given their respective ages. But Henry later began to learn Latin--a subject never taken up by his sisters. It was a subject generally not considered appropriate for females. As Mr. Brooke in Middlemarch put it, "such deep studies, classics, mathematics, that kind of thing, are too taxing for a woman--too taxing, you know."[23] It was clear too that Henry would become a clergyman. There was no such indication in the story that Lucy and Emily had prospects of further education outside the home. It is probable that their end, had Mrs. Sherwood chosen to show it, would have been like that of Serena in Always Happy!!!--mistresses of their aged parents' house or mistresses of their own houses if they married--for which little formal education was necessary. At eight and seven years old, Lucy and Emily were already being prepared for such an event:

> Besides working and reading, the little girls could do many useful things: they made their beds, rubbed the chairs and tables in their rooms, fed the fowls; and, when John was busy, they laid the cloth for dinner and waited upon their papa and mamma whilst they were eating.[24]

As in the case of boys, some of these girls, if they were of middle class or upper class families, would have received their instruction from a governess and or a tutor. If the family was particularly well-to-do, a master who specialized in one of the "accomplishments" such as drawing, painting, dancing, or music might be engaged, as in Flora by Elizabeth Somerville. Many of the girls in the fictional families, however, received their education from their mothers as Lucy and Emily Fairchild did. The level of instruction, of course, would depend on the ability of the mother, which in turn related to economic and social factors. The likelihood of a middle class girl like Lucy Fairchild receiving a reasonably good education from her mother was, of course, far greater than that of a lower class girl like Mrs. Cameron's Margaret Whyte. The latter received practical instruction from her mother in household management, some religious instruction, for the girl was renowned for her piety, but whether Margaret learned to read and write as Lucy and Emily Fairchild did was not certain.

It is interesting that a greater number of families sent their daughters to community schools than their sons. Fourteen families sent their daughters to such schools whereas only 5 sent their sons. The reasons for this difference are not clear, but they could reflect a belief, accurate in many cases, that community schools were not of particularly high quality. Such a school might not be good enough for the son but acceptable for a daughter whose prospects were much more limited. Attendance at community schools might also reflect the occupational interests or possibilities of many girls and their parents. Because one of the few respectable occupations open to women in the nineteenth century was in the field of teaching, either as a school teacher or a governess according to their social class, formal education even at a community school might have been deemed more necessary than otherwise.

Social class was a factor in the attendance of girls at community schools as it was with boys, but to a lesser extent. Where no upper class families sent their sons to community schools, 3 such families sent their daughters there. Although another 4 middle class families chose community schools for their daughters, the greatest number of those who took advantage to them were again lower class.

Six families sent their daughters outside the community for their schooling. Here the social class considerations played the greatest part, for the families involved were all upper and upper-middle class families, and the schools in question were élite boarding schools. Two books in particular, Correspondence Between a Mother and Her Daughter at School by Ann and Jane Taylor and Mary Campbell (1828) focused almost entirely on the boarding school experience.

Two families educated their daughters both at home and in the community. These families were presented in The Blind Farmer and His Children by Barbara Hofland and The History of Jane and Eliza Wentworth by Arnaud Berquin (1829), lower and middle class families respectively. Eight families educated their daughters both in the household and outside the community. In all cases but one, these were middle and upper class families. The one exception was the lower class family presented in The Scottish Orphans by Isabella Stoddart. It will be recalled that the children of this family were in fact of noble origin despite their humble surroundings. The children of both sexes were befriended by a gentleman and his wife and given an education suitable to their stations.

Only one girl was educated at home, in the community, and outside the community. This little girl appeared in Mrs. Cameron's book, The Two Mothers. Her situation was unusual in that she went with her mother to live for a time with an aunt in a distant county. She had previously received some schooling in her own community as well as at home.

The location of education for girls could not be determined or was not applicable for 36 families. In a number of cases of course, such as The History of Isaac Jenkins by Thomas Beddoes, the girls received no discernible instruction even in practical household management let alone reading and writing.

4. Educational Orientation

The educational ideas presented in the literature are best described as Evangelical. The term "Evangelical" in this period of history refers either to the Evangelical movement in the Church of England or the religious revival initiated by John Wesley but as G. M. Young observes, "Evangelicalism had imposed on society, even on classes which were indifferent to its religious basis...its code of Sabbath observance, responsibility, and philanthropy; of discipline in the home, regularity in affairs,"[25] and, it could be added, educational orientation. Evangelicalism was more than a religious creed. Even though naturalistic, romantic, and utilitarian concepts of childhood were not unknown and were even popular in some educational circles, they were absent in didactic children's literature. These concepts denied rather than affirmed the innate depravity of childhood, and were therefore anathema to didactic authors who as a group were sympathetic to Evangelicalism. One of the ways in which Evangelicals were able to "impose" their "code" on society was of course through didactic children's literature.

Because the Evangelicals did not entertain naturalistic or romantic concepts of the innate goodness of children, it does not follow that they had no concept of the "special characteristic" of childhood as described by Ariès. Evangelicals were painfully conscious of certain special characteristics such as weakness, willfulness, and selfishness. As already stated in this thesis, there is a sense in the literature of the awful responsibility of parents to God for the moral and spiritual safety of their children. Children were indeed a precious trust from God, a view not unlike that of the romantics, but with different consequences.[26] Where the romantics delighted in the innocence of the childish soul, the Evangelicals trembled at its depravity. As an anonymous Evangelical wrote in The Panoplist, and Missionary Magazine, September 1814:

> We often hear parents calling their children "harmless creatures," "pretty innocents," and other fond and endearing names which figuratively denote the same thing, such as "little doves," "harmless birds," with a thousand other equivalent appellations; and, I

> confess, I never hear them without trembling, lest those, their unfledged offspring, should prove birds of evil omen, if not birds of prey, fitted to be taken themselves at last in the snare of the fowler.[27]

This concept of childhood had distinct consequences for educational thought and practice. It meant that children were to be controlled rather than indulged, that their spirit be curbed rather than allowed to take its course. The following passage in the form of a dying mother's written request from Mrs. Cameron's The Fruits of Education outlines the Evangelical attitude towards childhood and education:

> It is my earnest request that my Maria may be early taught to bear the light yoke of her beloved Master; that she may be habituated to subdue her will to his; and to look for her chief happiness in the service of Him, in keeping of whose commandments there is great reward. I wish that her education may be of a very simple kind; such as will render her easily pleased, and contented under all the changes and chances of this life, and will fit her, in all circumstances, to discharge the duties of a daughter to that beloved father who is about, so early, to be deprived of the affectionate attention of the companion of his youth. I wish her to be brought up with a particular love for her brother, and with a deference to his opinions, provided he shall grow up according to the promise which he now gives. I have, in these requests, had a particular reference to her character, which, young as she is, I can already discern to be of an ardent, vain, and very lively turn. But the foundation of every thing good must be the same in both my children: a sincere conviction of the depravity of their own nature; a lively sense of God's mercy through Christ; with an abiding faith in Christ, as the Saviour of sinners; and a continual dependence on the assistance of the Holy Spirit to enable them to do anything that is good.[28]

In the literature, the attitude of 74 families toward the education of their sons could be described as Evangelical and another 3 were considered "other." The educational orientation of 42 families could not be determined. With respect to daughters, 89 families were considered Evangelical, 5 "other," and 25 could not be determined. "Other" included attitudes that were described as genteel, negligent, indulgent, or ungodly. An example of ungodly occurred in the book just noted, The Fruits of Education. The dying mother's request was not carried out in the education of her daughter. The two motherless children were raised by two different guardians, the daughter by a frivolous pleasure-loving cousin, the son by a godly uncle. The difference in their upbringing was obvious when the little boy came to stay with his sister after some time apart:

> When the children first met, they were exceedingly happy, but young as they were, a great difference was soon apparent in their tastes and pursuits. James, at first, would often bring his Bible into his sister's room, and read to her; and sometimes he would ask her to kneel down with him, and repeat a short prayer which his uncle had accustomed him to use in the middle of the day. He would relate many little stories his uncle had told him, of holy children, of saints and martyrs of elder days; at other times his conversation was chiefly about his rabbits, a favorite hawk, and a large dog, or other topics of similar kind. Before the month had half elapsed, there was a change in the habits of little James. He learned to play at cards with his sister and other children who visited her; he was becoming fond of eating nice things; and had gained some knowledge from Mrs. Danver's coachman, which was by no means profitable to a little boy.[29]

The uncle, Mr. Oakley, was dismayed at the change in James and concerned about the little girl. He expressed his views first to Mrs. Danvers, the girl's guardian, and later to the child herself:

> It has been my grand object to impress upon the mind of my little charge the immense importance of eternal things; to give him such a knowledge of the evil of his own heart as his tender years will admit, a knowledge which may shew them to himself as lost and

> undone without a Savior's help, and lead him to pray for that Spirit by whose assistance alone he can be made a new creature. Without an education of this kind, my dear cousin, we may indeed regulate the outward conduct of our children, at least in many respects, but we can never effectually control the heart and affections.[30]

> "You should often think of her /your dead mother/," said Mr. Oakley, "she was a kind mamma to you: and I have often heard from your brother James, that she used to tell you that you had a very naughty heart, and that you could not be good without the help of God's Holy Spirit; and that she taught you to pray to God to forgive you for all the wicked things you had done, for the sake of Jesus Christ who died on the cross for you."[31]

In James Manners, Little John, and their Dog Bluff by Elizabeth Somerville, the educational orientation was characterized by indulgence. As a result, the spoiled, unruly child grew up to be cruel, indolent, and a gambler. However, through the wise and persistent efforts of an uncle and the good example of John, the son of James's former nurse, James eventually saw the evil of his ways and became a reformed and reputable gentleman. The author's preface and conclusion are worthy of note:

> In writing the following sheets, I have endeavored to delineate the ill effects of false indulgence, by which all due respect to parents is destroyed, and children led to consider themselves the first object become discontented with everything around them, troublesome to others, and wearisome to themselves. As their years increase, the evil becomes more serious, for being accustomed to unlimited gratification, they rush, with the warmth and inexperience of youth, into the vortex of vice.

> Happy is the man, who, in the time of health and strength, sees and reforms the errors of his ways; but much more happy he, who has no past errors, no crimes to repent of. How unmixed and sincere must his joys be![32]

An indulgent attitude toward the education of daughters occurred in The Family Mansion by Ann Taylor and The Blind Brother and Sister by Catherine Parr Traill. In the former book, the daughter was unwisely indulged by her frivolous, indolent mother and the servants. As a result of her faulty upbringing, the daughter eloped with a man who was interested only in her money and status. Although the author did provide a happy ending for the story, the lesson was clear. Improper attention to education will have serious and perhaps fatal consequences. In The Blind Brother and Sister, Henrietta was a selfish and careless girl. Her father unwisely but understandably indulged her for he regretted the years he had been separated from her while in the army. When he retired, an invalid, he devoted himself to her. She did little to repay his devotion until he suffered a serious accident. She then learned duty, charity, and piety from a poor peasant girl who cared for her father and helped him recover. The story had a happy ending, but as in The Family Mansion, the warning was clear.

Hardly worse in its consequences than an indulgent attitude toward education was a negligent one. This occurred in Susannah by Mrs. Sherwood. Susannah's second guardian, a careless, indolent, self-indulgent woman, sadly neglected her family, her household, and of course the education of both her sons and daughters.

A "genteel" education was provided for both the sons and daughters of an upper class family in Anna Ross by Grace

Kennedy. This kind of education stressed accomplishments and manners, skills that would meet the expectations of upper class society. Academic studies were not emphasized.

In all cases, "others" were upper and middle class families.

5. Curriculum and Method

The importance of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries in the history of English education is affirmed by John Lawson and Harold Silver in A Social History of Education in England:

> In the half-century beginning in the 1780's education became one of the main areas of conflict in a profoundly changing society. The provision of mass education, and to a much lesser extent the reform of endowed schools and ancient universities, became persistent public issues. Sustained social change sharpens questions about the adequacy of existing social institutions, and from the late eighteenth century, in fact, sustained change became, to an extent unparalleled in previous centuries, the major characteristic of English society. This was not the first time...that schools, ideas about education, and systems of education, responded to larger changes in society, or were seen as instruments of such change.[33]

At best, only hints of conflict and change appear in the literature. This must be due in part to the very conservative nature of the literature itself and the Evangelical proclivities of the didactic authors. A critical interpretation of the Evangelicals is offered by Lawson and Silver:

> /The objective of the Evangelical movement with respect to education was/ to reserve the population for traditional, Christian roles. It aimed, not to adapt people to new conditions, but consciously to warn against social and moral dangers, in order to reinforce traditional religious codes of behavior. It was a movement at once to redeem an apathetic church, to educate an illiterate populace and to protect the social order.[34]

The curriculum offered fictional children was conservative. Religion was the most popular of the seven subject categories. The curriculum included the following subjects:

1. Classics--Latin and Greek grammar, composition and literature.
2. Science--study of plants, animals, birds, natural phenomena, elementary physics and chemistry.
3. Mathematics--arithmetic, geometry, trigonometry, algebra.
4. Modern Languages--English, French, Italian, German grammar, composition and literature.
5. Social Studies--history, geography, economics, biography.
6. Religion--catechism, Bible study, hymns, moral instruction.
7. Accomplishments--drawing, painting, dancing, music, fancywork, household management, riding, fencing, etc.

Very simple, elementary instruction and study of reading, writing, and arithmetic were grouped together under "primary studies." It was of course possible for children to study one or two subjects, all subjects, or any combination of subjects. Some children studied only religion.

In Preludes to Knowledge, subtitled "Amusing and Instructive Conversations on History, Astronomy, Geography, Optics, and the Division of Time, etc., etc., etc., also Moral and Entertaining Stories," the curriculum was carefully set out in the table of contents. The father, a widower with a son and a daughter, educated his children at home. Each of the following chapters contained one or more lessons:

Chapter I--Introduction.

Chapter II--Lesson for Pride--Story of an Insect Republic.

Chapter III--Virtue rewarded--Vice punished.

Chapter IV--Censure of Folly--Recrimination--A Battle, and further Punishment.

Chapter V--The Self-instructed Philospher, or Story of a Child nursed by a Goat in a desert Island.

Chapter VI--The Ass's Return for Cruely, and a Comparison.

Chapter VII--Fallen Greatness, or Man reduced by Wickedness to the Level of a Brute.

Chapter VIII--Meanness and Pride allied, or Humility not a cardinal Virtue.

Chapter IX--An improving Walk by Moon-light--Conversation on the Discovery and Utility of the Mariner's Compass, Telescope, Globes, etc.--Effects of Ignorance and Superstition--Eclipse and Cause, etc.--Astronomy, Geography, and of the whole Science of Physics, highly essential--Signs of Reformation.

Chapter X--More Reformation--Division of Time--Its Use, and Abuse.

Chapter XI--An Accident--A new Character--Discovery of the true Philosopher's Stone--Anecdote of a Great Man.

Capter XII--Giles Jenkins and his Dog Dash--A Request, which is the Means of introducing an inoffensive Character--Story of a suffering Quadruped.

Chapter XIII--The Brothers and the Blackbird.

Chapter XIV--Boldness of two Friars who endeavoured to dissuade King Henry the Eighth from a second marriage.

Chapter XV--The Country Journey--Tonbridge Wells /sic/ --Mineral Waters, etc.

Chapter XVI--The Virtuous Villager--Instability of Beauty--Comforts of Piety in Sickness.

Chapter XVII--The Cruelty of punishing Children for the faults of their Parents.

Chapter XVIII--Richmond, etc.

Chapter XIX--The Method used to teach a Prince of France to read--The Amusement of reading--The Generous Brother.[35]

It is important to note the careful way in which lessons built on one another and the conscious attempt to make them as interesting as possible for children. The curriculum clearly showed a consciousness of the special characteristics of childhood. It is also important to note the very wide range of subjects incorporated into the curriculum. Classics and accomplishments were the only subjects missing. Religion in the form of moral instruction was given the greatest place.

Overall, religion was given the greatest attention in the literature for both boys and girls. The following table indicates the popularity of each subject in the curriculum according to sex. The numbers represent families rather than individual sons and daughters. Because families provided the same sort of education for all their sons or all their daughters, the curriculum for only one child of each sex was considered. In providing for their children's education, families differentiated between the sexes rather than within the same sex.

TABLE 9

POPULARITY OF SUBJECTS IN THE CURRICULUM

Subject	Boys	Girls
Classics	28	3
Science	36	18
Mathematics	25	3
Modern Languages	23	30
Social Studies	34	21
Religion	58	63
Accomplishments	30	62
Primary Studies	9	21
N/A, N/G	49	25

The biggest difference in the curricula for boys and girls was in science, classics, and mathematics. The difference of course reflects nineteenth century concepts of women. Men and women were believed to have their separate spheres. Marriage, family, and home were expected to constitute a woman's sphere, her source of pleasure and fulfillment. For this the "deep studies, classics, mathematics, that kind of thing" were not necessary and were after all "too taxing for a woman."[36] Music, drawing, needlework, and similar activities or "accomplishments" were emphasized in the curriculum for girls in the literature. Accomplishments were emphasized twice as often for girls as for boys.

There was some support in the literature for including so-called masculine subjects in the curriculum for girls. For example, when in The Child's Birth-day by Isaac Taylor, Eliza asked her father, "Why, papa, is geometry ever taught to young ladies?" he replied with some humor:

> Not often, I believe. But if education is intended to fit them for understanding what they read and hear, many things should be taught in schools, even to young ladies, which at present they never hear of; except some pert brother, who has obtained a smattering of more scientific knowledge, thinks to pose them, by a few terms which he knows they cannot understand; make them stare while he states a parallel case; or frightens the maid by desiring her to dislocate the frustrum of truncated cone out of the way, (which is nothing but a pail), and cease those gyrations which give so much centrifugal power to the coalesced fluid, till he be gone beyond her or a bit, or at least away from the immediate vortex.[37]

At another point in the same book, however, the father contributed the following poem which leads the reader to question

C

the father's commitment to the idea that the normal curriculum for girls should be expanded:

> See the sister, hand in hand,
> Tottering, lisping, frisking wild;
> He boisterous, she with manners bland,
> More timid, modest, pliant, mild;
> Quicker, more docile, reads before her brother;
> Begins to dress her doll, to act the mother
> A softer, sweeter form, a feebler, fairer child.
>
> Separate studies now they seek,
> As their duties separate:
> See her, beside her mother meek;
> See him, his father imitate.
> The mind still growing rich in cultivation;
> Preparing well to fit each coming station:
> The warm heart taught to glow, with feelings just
> and great.
>
> Now the nimble fingers try
> The tiny needle's utmost powers;
> Samplers shine in many a dye,
> Proof of silent, patient hours;
> Or useful vestments show the housewife knowing;
> Or rich embroidery, like the rainbow glowing,
> And rivall'd Flora smiles, while rise her fairest
> flowers.[38]

Separate spheres were also indicated in Maria Budden's book, Always Happy!!!:

> The children flew eagerly to their books, reading, writing and spelling; each came forward in turn.--Felix and his father devoted half an hour to Latin grammar, whilst Serena bringing her stool, sat down to work by her mother; she was hemming a handkerchief for her brother.[39]

Serena, it will be recalled, continued to hem, sew, and do fancywork at home while her brother went away to school. Serena would, however, have some opportunity for further study, but only after she had learned needlework "for it is necessary" her mother told her.

> "Music, drawing, and dancing are unnecessary, and must therefore be only thought of as amusements...."

> "But French I shall certainly learn" [said Serena]--
> "Yes [her mother answered] French is now almost become a necessary part of education...."[40]

Foreign languages, particularly French, were a necessary part of education, but they were also considered a mark of cultivation and hence were very important to the middle and upper classes. More girls than boys in the literature seem to have been encouraged to study modern languages. For boys, the study of the classical languages took precedence.

Knowledge of languages was a necessary part of a girl's curriculum, especially if she was expected to support herself in the future. It was required of a governess, one of the few respectable occupations open to women in the nineteenth century. Charlotte Brontë listed French among her poor heroine's qualifications in an advertisement for a position as a governess in *Jane Eyre*:

> "A young lady accustomed to tuition" (had I not been a teacher two years?) "is desirous of meeting with a situation in a private family where the children are under fourteen....She is qualified to undertake the usual branches of a good English education, together with French, Drawing, and Music" (in those days, reader, this now narrow catalogue of accomplishments, would have been held tolerably comprehensive). "Address J. E., Post Office, Lowton, --shire."[41]

In *Flora* by Elizabeth Somerville, the appropriate curriculum for a little upper class girl was outlined as follows:

> Flora was carefully taught music, geography, grammar, drawing, etc., etc., and the theoretic part of every science of which Mrs. Friendly thought necessary for an elegant and retentive mind, wishing her at once to avoid the appearance of ignorance, or the pedantic consequence of knowing too much.[42]

Mr. Grove, a middle class clergyman, gave great thought to female education in *The Two Mothers* by Mrs. Cameron:

> Everything being now permanently settled for Mary-Anne's continuance with her uncle and aunt, their plans of education respecting her enlarged....Mr. Grove commenced a plan, which, if he had had daughter of his own, he had always purposed to have put in execution. He often lamented, that while good mothers are actively endeavouring to inspire into their little sons those peculiar excellencies in which themselves are most preeminent, piety, gentleness, and constancy, fathers too often neglect to cultivate in their daughters the powers of reasoning and steady application to one subject, fortitude, courage, and decision of mind. "Brothers and sisters," he would say, "grow up together under the common government of father and mother, that both may receive those peculiar advantages which the instructions of the other sex are calculated to bestow, as well as of the parent in whose steps they are particularly designed to tread." Mr. Grove therefore wished that every girl should be instructed by her father in some one branch of knowledge, usually considered as more peculiarly masculine; not to afford her any cause for display, but simply to strengthen those faculties of mind in which she was most deficient: and, in pursuance with this plan, he took Mary-Anne into his study for the first hour after breakfast. Nor were her aunt's plans for her improvement at all disconcerted, but, on the contrary, much furthered, by the time she spent with her uncle: for her mind becoming inured to something like a habit of severer study than girls usually possess, she gained a readiness in overcoming those little difficulties in her ordinary lessons which had formerly occasioned considerable hindrance; and hence her progress became proportionably rapid.[43]

Mr. Grove's commitment to a broader curriculum for girls appeared more serious than that of Eliza's father in The Child's Birth-day. Mr. Grove still, however, believed in separate spheres, as his emphasis on role modeling indicates.

In The Visit by Miss Grierson, a story about an upper-middle class family, a different subject was added to the curriculum for girls. In addition to learning grammar, spelling, natural history, botany, and religion, the girls spent some time in physical exercises:

> ...previous to the commencement of their serious studies, the young ladies engaged in certain bodily exercises which consisted in the use of the dumb-bells aforementioned, and in the whole of the *corps des enfants* performing certain manual operations, at the sound of the following words: *Levez les bras*--*étendez*--*en derrière*--*à côte*--*marchez droit, gauche*,--*gauche, droit*, after which they made many exits and entrances.

This physical exercise was part of the normal routine of the school. The school was conducted in a room of the house and judging from the author's description, it was very well equipped. Only the curriculum for girls was given here, for the only boy in the family was an infant. It should be noted that the girls' instructions were given in French.

French, music, drawing, physical education, and whatever "serious" subjects a family might wish their daughter to learn, were part of the curriculum for upper and middle class girls. However limited their curriculum might have been, the curriculum for lower class girls was even more restrictive. Although the various schools for the poor did provide a modicum of education and did prepare some children to earn a living, the schools could hardly have inspired many of their pupils with a great love of learning. Such a school was described by Hannah More in *The Shepherd of Salisbury Plain*. Mr. Johnson, a wealthy man, proposed to set up in a rural parish a Sunday school and a "small weekly school" where "ten to a dozen girls" would be taught to "knit, sew, spin, card, or any other useful way of getting their bread."[45]

Among the middle and upper classes, social studies, science, and religion were studied by both sexes. Social studies, in particular history and biography, was popular because it could be used to teach moral lessons as Mr. Mordaunt explained in Preludes to Knowledge by Elizabeth Somerville:

> The wisest and most virtuous, amidst the dangers and obstacles with which they are surrounded, stand in need of instruction and example. History supplies us with every kind of them. Tully tells us that history taught him to suffer the utmost extremeties, and to despise all dangers for the service of his country. How many models of virtue (says he) are left us in history, and which are laid before us, not merely to be looked at, but to be imitated; by studying them incessantly, and by endeavouring to copy them I have formed not only my mind but my heart.[46]

The importance of studying biography was discussed in Improvement by Diana Bayley:

> /Charles/ I do think, grandmamma, I shall in future take great delight in studying biography.
> Mrs. Agar. Indeed, my Charles, you will find it not only a pleasing but a profitable course of reading; it is at once the most entertaining and instructive kind of history. Nor do I know any books so generally well adapted for the youthful mind; the wonderful effect that example has over us is universally allowed. And when we contemplate the noble and virtuous actions which have distinguished the lives, and dignified the characters of our fellow creatures, we naturally feel inspired by a desire to imitate, and, if possible, to arrive at the same pinnacle of greatness. It is a generous ambition, and particularly congenial to the ardour of youth; cultivate the desire, my boy, and you will ultimately reap the reward.
> Maria. And I, grandmamma, will endeavour, by application and industry, to store my mind with resources which (your example has proved) will produce happiness more grateful than what is usually called "the pleasures of life."[47]

The author of Emulation (1827), subtitled, "the Way to be Great and Happy," considered a study of history and biography essential to moral education. As the author wrote in the introduction:

> In no time, perhaps, is it of such paramount importance rightly to direct and encourage the principles of Emulation, as in the early stages of education. The ardent and undisciplined feelings of youth are alike unable and unwilling to distinguish the different qualities of character, and make the distinction of parts worthy of imitation or censure. Whatever interests or gratifies their feelings in a few prominent features, generally attracts their undivided admiration and is treasured up in their recollections as models highly desirable for future imitation. With this circumstance in view, the writer has made a brief selection of such facts as may both amuse them at the time, and incite the cultivation of those qualities which will conduce to their happiness and credit in future life.[48]

The author demonstrated the way history and biography could be used to amuse and instruct and turn misfortune into profit in the story of little Alfred. Alfred was impatient for the arrival of his aunt's servant who was to take him to visit her. His mother suggested that he work on his lessons, for "time spent in active and useful employment always passes much more pleasantly than when idled away,"[49] but Alfred preferred to dig in his garden. Unfortunately, Alfred sprained his ankle while digging, a consequence of his willfulness, no doubt, and he could not go to his aunt's after all. His mother put him to bed and reproved him for not taking her advice. She was able to turn the incident to good account by telling him entertaining stories of individuals worthy of emulation. As she told the little boy:

> You will find that, by degrees, if you try to make the best use of every evil that may happen to you, the difficulty will become less every time; and this will be the way to become great and happy. It very often appears that circumstances which we at first think very unfortunate and disagreeable, may cause us much real benefit and pleasure.[50]

In Montague Park by A. Selwyn (1825), and Education at Home by Edgar White Benson, history and biography were also stressed, again as a vehicle for moral instruction. In the former book, the governess told her small charge:

> In the page of history we behold the deformity of vice stripped of its deceitful allurements, and thus unmasked, its hideous aspect offers a warning lesson to youth, lest they, too, in an unguarded moment, should fall into the snares spread to entangle their innocence; while, on the contrary, virtue is revealed to our view in its most inestimable light, so that it cannot fail of exciting our admiration. We wish to imitate the example of those who have rendered themselves illustrious by the virtue and purity of their lives; and at the same time, pity and condemn others whose characters are shaded with the dark clouds of envy, pride, ambition, and cruelty. History...perused under these reflections, must prove a source of never-ending instruction to the rational and reasoning mind...I have often heard... that the careful perusal of history was of that beneficial influence that it caused the expansion of the ideas, and stimulated the mind to deeds of further exertion and improvement; and that it ought to be studied at least one hour every day.[51]

In Education at Home the study of history was made particularly entertaining through the production of historical dramas about Cyrus the Great and Charles II.

The study of geography was stressed in a number of stories. In Preludes to Knowledge, Mr. Mordaunt emphasized the importance of geography to the study of history:

> In the study of history...do not forget to consult your maps and charts, and to impress on your memory the exact period when any remarkable event happened; chronology and geography are so highly essential to the right understanding of what you read, that without them, a mere knowledge of circumstances will be but perplexed and confused.[52]

Science was an important part of the curriculum. In many fictional families, particularly in those where the children were small, science took form of studying plants, animals, and birds. Many children, like Rousseau's little Emile, had their own gardens where they learned not only some botany but also such moral lessons as industry, responsibility, and respect for property. It will be recalled that Arthur in Emulation had his own garden--that was where he had the misfortune to sprain his ankle while digging. In The Advantages of Education Elucidated, Matilda Wingfield was given lessons in natural science and a small plot of ground for a flower garden. Gardening was also popular for children in Always Happy!!! and Right and Wrong by Maria Budden, The Daughter-in-law her Father, and Family by Barbara Hofland, Lucy Newton, The Way to be Happy (1819), The Little Quaker, and Mary and Florence by Ann Tytler. Although Henry Fairchild did not have his own plot of ground, Mr. Fairchild and the servant John did let the little boy work in the garden:

> ...when he had finished his lessons in a morning, his papa used to take him very often to work in the garden; for Mr. Fairchild had great pleasure in helping John to keep the garden clean. Henry had a little basket, and he used to carry the weeds and rubbish in this basket out of the garden, and do many such other things as his papa set him to.[53]

In Fabulous Histories, or The History of the Robins as the book was later known, Mrs. Benson devoted considerable time and energy to explaining to her children the characteristics and habits not only of the robin family that shared the Benson's garden, but also those of numerous other birds, animals, and insects. Many of her explanations and descriptions were extremely detailed and indicated that the author had observed "the animal creation" closely over a considerable period of time. Mrs. Benson's, or rather, Mrs. Trimmer's habit of turning every natural science lesson into a moral discourse should not obscure the careful scientific observation behind it. Very interesting was Mrs. Benson's reference to using a microscope when she was a child:

> When I was a little girl, said Mrs. Benson, I had a great propensity to catching flies and other insects, but my father had an excellent microscope in which he shewed me a number of different objects; by this means I learnt, that even the minutest creatures might be as susceptible of pain as myself; and I declare I cannot put any thing to death, without fancying I hear its bones crack, and that I see its blood gushing from its veins and arteries; and so far from having a pleasure in killing even the disagreeable insects which are troublesome in houses, I assure you I cannot do it myself, nor see it done without pain....[54]

In Preludes to Knowledge by Elizabeth Somerville, science consisted of more than the elementary study of plants and animals. A father discussed such things as the use of the mariner's compass, telescopes, globes, eclipses, and the study of astronomy and physics.

Religion, which included catechism, learning hymns, study of the Bible, and moral lessons, was the most important subject in the curriculum for both boys and girls. The Fairchild children normally joined their parents in prayers three times a day, and in addition to their regular lessons, they had hymns and verses from the Bible to learn. Mr. and Mrs. Fairchild did not fail to make use of every opportunity to provide religious and moral instruction. A geography lesson, for example, became a lesson on the "General Depravity of Mankind in all Countries after the Fall." Mr. Fairchild pointed out on a globe various countries, continents, and geographical features and gave their relationship to incidents in the Bible. The children's first lesson began as follows:

> And first he taught them that the Globe was divided into four quarters; Europe, Asia, Africa, and America.
> "Asia is that part of the world," said Mr. Fairchild, "in which the Garden of Eden, or Paradise, was supposed to have been placed, where the first man, Adam, lived."
> "Oh, Papa!" said Emily, "shew us where the Garden of Eden was.
> "Here it was," said Mr. Fairchild, "as it is supposed, upon the borders of the river Euphrates, which was one of the four rivers of Paradise."
> "Papa," said Henry, "I can repeat the verses in Genesis about Paradise...."

And so Henry did. The lesson continued with Mr. Fairchild's comment on Paradise:

> "Paradise, my dears," said Mr. Fairchild, "was a most lovely place, such as we never saw; for there is no place now in this world in which the ruin caused by sin does not appear. But when Adam and Eve were tempted by the devil to eat the forbidden fruit, they were cast out of Paradise; their bodies became subject to sickness and death; and their hearts became exceedingly corrupt, and all their children, who have since been born in their likeness, are utterly and entirely sinful: so that of ourselves we cannot do a good thing or think a good thought."
> "Papa," said Lucy, "may we say some verses, about mankind having bad hearts?"
> "Yes, my dear," said Mr. Fairchild.
> Then each of the children repeated a verse from the Bible, to prove that the nature of man, after the Fall of Adam, is utterly and entirely sinful.[55]

Other lessons proceeded in much the same way.

Mr. Fairchild's method of combining geography with religion in one lesson was not uncommon in the literature, and probably many nineteenth century parents did much the same thing following the highly respected Mrs. Trimmer's recommendations in Guardian of Education:

> Even Geography, Writing and Arithmetic may be made, in some measure, subservient to religious instruction by proper observations on the form and division of the earth among the different nations which inhabit it; by a judicious use of copies; and by quotations relative to Scripture History.[56]

An interesting discussion of religious instruction occurred in Lucy Newton. Lucy, a motherless girl, was adopted by two well-meaning maiden ladies. One of these ladies had very firm views on Lucy's religious education which the author sharply criticized:

> Mrs. Mary...though her mistakes were those of a good woman, mistakes they certainly were. Proceeding from the doctrine of the radical and deep corruption of nature, a doctrine which she understood in the strictest Calvinistic sense, her meditations led her to the best means of converting the little Lucy. And with that extremely partial view which is generally taken by persons who have given themselves the habit of dwelling chiefly on one class of Scripture passages, while they have glanced slightly over others, she entirely left out of the account, the fact that a renewed and spiritual nature is not exclusively the gift of God to adults, but that children may be partakers of the same; nay, that the same good Being who has imparted a portion of his immortal, immaterial Spirit to them, has distinguished between the flesh and the spirit; allowing that the former may be a source of continual conflict, while the latter consents to a better law. She did not reflect that, as on her own shewing all goodness is derived from the Deity, she could not possibly account for anything of the sort in little Lucy but by ascribing it to him. In fact, she thought of nothing but the certainty of the poor child's being now under the wrath of a holy God, and of the absolute essential importance of using every effort to draw from her this alarming state. It was natural that such a view should impart some solemnity to her countenance; and the poor child shrunk back with instinctive dread of the melancholy-looking being who took her seat at the breakfast table.[57]

A benevolent friend and Sunday School teacher observed Lucy's lack of progress in faith, and divined that it was due to the methods used to teach her. Her statement was critical of harsh, insensitive methods of teaching children:

> I would have those parts of the Bible selected which are suitable to her age and feelings. The narrative of the Old Testament, the benevolent purpose and character of Jesus, the works he did, and the instruction he gave will all be, under the blessing of God, most serviceable. But I object to calling upon a child to believe a doctrine which concerns her own feelings and consciousness, before she has felt the consciousness of it. One of two things must then happen:--either the child does violence to her own most sacred feelings, and persuades herself that she really believes, or, if she is resolute, she is hardened against the Scriptures for requiring what, to her seems an impossibility.[58]

Gentler methods had their effect, and Lucy did come to love the word of God.

The tone of the author's criticism suggests that harsh "terror tactics" were a common means of teaching religion to children. The author's later defense of more sensitive methods is particularly telling:

> We are painting the feelings of no every day being, and know that there may be some who will shrink with dread from a certain apparent irregularity in progress: but there are others who will feel the value of an experience differing, in many points, from the common one; as they will remember that truth, though differently presented, was no less the stay and support of her spirit than of theirs.[59]

Interestingly, criticism of harsh, insensitive teaching methods came also from Mrs. Sherwood in Susannah. Lawrence Stone criticized the harshness of her major work, The History of the Fairchild Family, yet she wrote critically of little Susannah's educational experience at the hands of one of her guardians:

> I was made to stand by the working table for two hours learning long columns of spelling and sundry dry catechisms, of which I did not understand a single sentence.[60]

Surprisingly, considering the number of edifying deaths in The History of the Fairchild Family, Mrs. Sherwood also appeared to be critical in Susannah of the common practice of bringing children to death beds for religious and moral instruction. Susannah's utter horror on such an occasion seemed to cancel the edification she was expected to receive.

Susannah, published in 1827, and Lucy Newton, published in 1830, may reflect a weakening of Evangelical fervour or stand as a caution against assuming that all Evangelical parents believed uncompromisingly in childhood depravity.

Moral instruction cannot be separated from religious instruction in the literature, but as the examples have shown, moral instruction pervaded the entire curriculum. Table 10 lists the virtues and vices expressed most frequently in the literature.

In some books and stories, moral instruction went beyond simple pious platitudes. No doubt the didactic authors who chose to present dramatic or sensational examples of virtues and vices believed that such examples would have greater impact and hence be more memorable and effective. For example, in order to impress upon his sons the importance of industry, Mr. Hervey in Education at Home initiated a visit to a prison. After an introductory description of the "dejected and sickly appearance of many of the prisoners," "the damp and dusky apartments in which they were confined,"

TABLE 10

VIRTUES AND VICES EXPRESSED IN THE LITERATURE

Virtues	Vices
Industry	Vanity
Charity	Frivolousness
Piety	Envy
Duty	Discontent
Humility	Procrastination
Obedience	Greed
Perseverance	Cruelty
Regularity	Mimicry
Filial Piety	Selfishness
Cheerfulness	Pride
Thrift	Passion
Gentleness	Indulgence
Kindness	Indolence
Patience	Quarrelling
Thoughtfulness	Negligence
Honesty	Affectation
Fortitude	Gaming
Bravery	Profanity
Modesty	Drunkenness
Good Manners	Curiousity
Neatness	Expectation
Sincerity	
Devotion	

"the gloomy aspect of the massy stone walls and the windows strongly grated with iron bars," the author presented the first four cells:

> The first cell they looked into, was the debtors'. It was a low, arched apartment; the windows secured by massy iron bars let deeply into a heavy stone frame, and intersected by others. Around a few embers burning on the hearth, were seated, in profound silence, several melancholy, emaciated-looking men. In one corner, laid upon a little straw, was a man apparently dying of the ague. Between the bars of the window, was squeezed the crown of an old hat, beside it was fastened a slip of wood, with "Remember the poor debtors," carved in rude characters upon it. "Here may be," said Mr. Hervey, "among these wretched men, some unfortunates, who have been ruined by unavoidable misfortunes: but the greatest part are men, who found it easier to live by taking goods which they had it not in their power to pay for; and by borrowing money which they could not return, than by working to procure an honest livelihood. 'Idleness is the root of all evil.'"[61]

The last cell was the worst of all. It was the condemned cell, "the apartment in which persons are confined between the time that sentence of death is passed upon them, and of its being carried into execution." The appearance of the cell caused the boys to shudder and grasp their father's hand. Mr. Hervey knew the wretched prisoner by name and persuaded him to tell the story of his life. The man agreed:

> Though it may be painful to me, to think over my past life of sin and wickedness, if it will amuse you, sir, and be of any use to these young gentlemen, in warning them of the danger of acquiring evil habits of idleness, it is at your service. Idleness was my ruin. Idleness is the root of all evil.[62]

An effective if not sensational means of discouraging the vice of drink occurred in The History of Isaac Jenkins by Thomas Beddoes. The benevolent doctor, Mr. Langford, wished to discourage Isaac from drinking by exposing him to Mr. Simcox:

> This poor man was now daily growing worse and worse; and at last became a hideous spectacle, quite a monster, with his legs enormously swelled, his face bloated, and gasping for breath: he was now in his sickness as penitent, as he had been before confident, in the hey-day of his health and high spirits, that drinking would never hurt him....One day, a dreadful fit of hard breathing having seized him, his daughter cried out for some body to come up stairs and help, for her father was dying....Isaac hurried up stairs directly; what a sight to behold: the swoln /sic/ unweildy farmer, with his face as black as your hat, snapping for a mouthful of air; and when he was raised and had recovered his breath a little, repeating in a doleful tone out of the Psalms --"My strength faileth me, because of my iniquity; and my bones are consumed; my wickednesses are gone over my head; and are like a sore burden, too heavy for me to bear."
> In the progress of Simcox's disorder, his legs burst, and the holes at which the water oozed out began to mortify. One Sunday afternoon, as Isaac was sitting with him, and his daughter was dressing the wounds, he would look at his legs, and every now and then cry out, "my sores stink and are corrupt; through my foolishness, I am brought into so great trouble and misery that I go mourning all the day long; there is no whole part of my body!"--This and much more to the same purpose Isaac reported to me, and all things taken together, you cannot wonder, if these penetential ejaculations made a much deeper impression upon him than all the sermons he had ever heard in his life.[63]

An equally shocking means of discouraging quarrelling occurred in The History of the Fairchild Family.[64] It will be recalled that Mr. Fairchild took his three children to Blackwood to show them the rotting corpse of a man hanging on a gibbet. The victim was a man who had hated his brother and later murdered him.[65]

In The First Theft by Mrs. Marshall, greed led a little girl deep into further vice. When her depravity became known, the shock killed her mother. In The Good Aunt by Harriet Ventum, the consequences of uncontrolled passion were vividly illustrated in the story of Maria, a young woman who murdered her only child in a fit of passion and consequently lost her reason. "Learn then," the good aunt told her niece, "the necessity of bridling your passions."

> Believe me, it is easier to subdue them in youth than in age; they gather strength from indulgence, and too often, as in the tale I have just related, are productive of the most fatal consequences; thus you see, my dear, if you do not subdue your passions, your passions will conquer you.[66]

Incidents like these, sparing no graphic details, must have made a lasting impression on many young readers.

Many stories, however, expressed virtues and vices simply and without color or excitement. In The Good Mother's Legacy Hannah More stated plainly:

> Mrs. Adams brought up her two eldest sons to the farming business: no part of their good mother's instruction were lost upon them; they were sober, diligent, and dutiful; they never frequented a market or a fair, but for the necessary purpose of buying and selling their cattle; and their business was no sooner over, then they returned home to give their mother a faithful account of what they had done. Mrs. Adams' children were never present at any revelling or merry-making in the parish; and as a reward for their dutiful behavior, she often made some little entertainment for them at home, and gave them the liberty also of inviting some of their friends; for she would say, "I love to see young people cheerful and happy, but I tremble to have them dancing in ale-houses, which takes away their modesty--or getting drunk, which turns them into brutes--or prophanely cursing and swearing to the endangering of their immortal souls."[67]

Duty, diligence, sobriety, filial piety, cheerfulness, and modesty were the virtues emphasized here; frivolousness, drunkenness, and profanity were the vices condemned.

Piety was a virtue not always taught by adults to children; often children taught adults and other children through words or example. In Memoirs of Emma and her Nurse by Mrs. Cameron, little Jane, a servant in a godless house, converted her fellow servants to piety:

> Sometimes she /the housekeeper/ asked Jane to read a chapter in the Bible or sing a psalm, and would make many inquiries about the things which she had learned from her lady at school. Jane was pleased to find that the housekeeper seemed to take increasing pleasure in these things: and the house-steward also would listen to the Bible when Jane read it, and sometimes, when she had finished reading, he would take up the Bible himself, a thing which the housekeeper said she had never seen him do before.[68]

Jane also instructed the daughter of her mistress after the pious woman's death, and the little girl in turn taught her godless father. As Mrs. Cameron wrote:

> ...it was sweet to observe the pains which the little creature took to engage him in religion. She would often find verses in her Bible, and bring them to him, and ask him to read them, and then inquire if he did not think them pretty....[69]

Similarly, in The History of Margaret Whyte; or the Life and Death of a Good Child, another book by Mrs. Cameron, a little girl taught her playmates to be good and pious. Following Margaret's prolonged but happy death, the story concluded as follows:

> I am very happy to say, that the life and death of Margaret, and the good example she set them, has had a happy effect upon all the children in the village who knew her, particularly upon Nancy Hooper and Dickey Jones, who by her means promise to turn out very well. They both delight to visit her grave, round which they have planted flowers. It is on the north side of the church, under the great yew tree, a spot of which Margaret in her life-time was always fond. Here many of the children love to meet on a fine Sunday evening. Sometimes they bring their Bibles to read, or they will talk about Margaret, and of that time when our souls shall leave our bodies, and we shall ascend up into heaven to live with all our friends who have trusted in Jesus Christ and served their heavenly Father here. I hope that all children, who may read the story of Margaret Whyte, will make it their endeavour to be like

> her; and let them learn, that the only way to be numbered among God's children in this world, and to enter into eternal life in the next, is, by diligent prayer to seek for the forgiveness of their sins through his special grace, to do their duty towards God and their neighbour, and to strive to be perfect, even as their Father which is in heaven is perfect.[70]

Piety included keeping the Sabbath holy. In many fictional families, the injunction was taken very seriously. In the Fairchild family, for example, Sunday was devoted to prayer and meditation. The family attended church in the morning and, depending on the season of the year, returned in the evening or held a small family service in their home. On Saturday the servant did all the cooking and cleaning for Sunday "so that she might have nothing to do, when she came from church on the Sunday, but to boil a few potatoes."[71] The children helped the servant, got their Sunday clothes ready, and performed all their necessary tasks on Saturday so that they too would have no work to do "but God's work, the sweetest of all works, work which angels delight to do."[72] Mr. Fairchild was very strict about the kind of conversation he would permit on Sundays. He would not allow his family to come home from church "and chatter together about foolish things, until they have quite forgotten all the holy words they have heard in the church."

> "You might just as well," Mr. Fairchild would say, "sow good seeds in your fields, and then turn in a flock of birds to pick them all up, as go to church, and afterwards meet and talk and chatter till you have forgotten every thing you have heard."[73]

And at dinner

> Mr. Fairchild would not allow his family to talk about any of the business of the weekdays, or even talk of their neighbours: they found enough pleasant discourse in speaking of what they had heard in the church, or of what had happened in the school....[74]

Of course only reading material of a religious nature was permitted on Sundays.

In The Sister's Friend by Mrs. Cameron, a little girl was properly horrified to find her brother was not reading the Scriptures on Sunday:

> Lucy dismissed her little party, and walking up to the fireplace where William was sitting, how great was her astonishment at finding he was reading a book of fairy tales, and with unaffected gravity she said to him, "Oh, William, how can you spend the golden hours of Sunday in such a way as this!"[75]

In Education at Home by Edgar White Benson, Mr. Hervey expressed firm but not unreasonable views on keeping the Sabbath. For example, he admitted that it was not wrong for the surgeon to neglect church at times and to ride to visit his patients on Sundays:

> Because attending the sick, is a work of necessity, as well as charity, and it would be impossible for him to visit half his patients unless he rode, therefore, making the horse to labour on Sunday, is with him a work of necessity.[76]

In general, Mr. Hervey believed that

> The only works that we may do, are works of charity and of necessity; we are always, and at all times, commanded to do good, and to work righteousness. All secular employments are to cease; we are to give this day entirely to God; and, surely, it is not too much to give one day in seven to him, who gave us all that we possess ....[77]

Vanity was a vice that concerned many didactic authors. In Mamma's Stories, a collection of stories about four little girls, a vain girl was cruelly humiliated for her attempt to improve her appearance for a tea party by imitating a fashionable lady who was known to use rouge. Unfortunately for little Mary, she only succeeded in making herself the object of ridicule. Everyone at the tea party, including her mother and the hostess, laughed at Mary's painted cheeks, and "even a dog who was sitting by the fire-side, hearing them all laugh, came and barked a merry bark at poor Mary." Her parents resolved that Mary

> should not be spoken to by any body, nor be looked at by any body, except when it was necessary; and that every one should seem to forget her, and pay her as little attention as possible, till she was quite cured of her vanity, and till she had learned that good-humour and obliging manners were more likely to gain esteem, than rouge and fine dress.[78]

The Fairchild sisters were cautioned against vanity after Mrs. Fairchild had dressed them in their best clothes for a visit to Sir Charles and Lady Noble's house:

> Mrs. Fairchild dressed Lucy and Emily, and made them sit quietly down on two little stools....As Lucy and Emily sat in the corner of the room, Lucy looked at Emily, and said, "Sister, how pretty you look!" "And how neat you look, Lucy!" said Emily: "these frocks are very pretty, and make us look very well."
> "My dear little girls," said Mrs. Fairchild, who overheard what they said to each other, "do not be conceited because you have got your best frocks on. You now think well of yourselves, because you fancy you are well dressed: by and bye, when you get to Lady Noble's, you will find Miss Augusta much finer dressed than yourselves; then you will be out of humour with yourselves for as little reason as you are now pleased. Do you remember the verses I made you learn, Lucy, concerning one who cometh into the assembly of the Christians in fine clothes?"[79]

Lucy did remember the verses and dutifully recited them for her mother.

Vanity was similarly condemned in The Child's Birth-day by Isaac Taylor. On her birthday, Eliza's brother and sister adorned her with flowers so that she looked "like a little queen." When the mother was called to see Eliza in the arbour, the former was more than willing to come for she perceived

> here was a circumstance well deserving her watchful eye, perhaps her regulating judgement; as all these flattering joys poured into the little heart of a little girl, might be enough to intoxicate her with pleasure, at least, if not with pride and self-conceit.[88]

But "the view of the arbour, and the children in it, did, indeed, delight the mother's heart":

> The mother's first glance was at Eliza's countenance, which set her heart at ease; for although much elation was discernible in it, yet scarcely had pride touched a single feature: all was simplicity and mere delight; which the kindnesses poured upon her from every quarter must necessarily excite, in a feeling bosom.
> To bring this elation down to a more solemn level, seemed, however, to be desirable; and the attainment of her object was facilitated by the appearance of a large, beautiful butterfly, which settled on the jessamine that ran up the side of the arbour.[81]

The butterfuly was indeed beautiful; so beautiful that Eliza's brother was forced to declare "it looks finer than you Eliza, with all your flowers, though we have taken so much pains to dress you up."

> This was the application which her mother wished; and glancing an eye of kindness on the child, whose countenance showed she fully felt the comparison, said, "Eliza never doubted that, I dare say. She remembers those applicable lines of Dr. Watts:
> "Let me be drest fine as I will,
> Flies, worms, and flowers, exceed me still."
> Eliza was beginning to pull off the garland from her head, which her mother observing, said: "There is no harm, my love, in those flowers: they were made to be enjoyed; no harm in your wearing them on such an occasion as this. The only evil, either in the sight of

> God or man, in finery, is, when our hearts are elated with such trifling, because external ornaments, and our time taken up in them beyond their true proportion and value."[82]

Charity was emphasized in many books and stories, as the number of examples presented in the previous chapter indicate. Closely associated with this virtue was of course kindness extended not only to fellow human beings but also to "the animal creation." Fabulous Histories by Mrs. Trimmer was in fact, as the author stated, "designed for the instruction of children respecting their treatment of animals":

> It certainly comes within the compass of Christian Benevolence, to shew compassion to the Animal Creation; and a good mind naturally inclines to do so. But as, through an erroneous education, or bad example, many children contract habits of tormenting inferior creatures, before they are conscious of giving them pain, or fall into the contrary fault of immoderate tenderness to them; it is hoped, that an attempt to point out the line of conduct which ought to regulate the actions of human beings, towards those, over whom the SUPREME GOVERNOR hath given them dominion, will not be thought a useless undertaking: and that the mode of conveying instruction on this subject, which the Author of the following sheets has adopted, will engage the attention of young minds, and prove instrumental to the happiness of many an innocent animal.[83]

Although Mrs. Trimmer repeatedly stressed that a clear distinction must be made between the animal and human creation lest one's duty towards one's fellow human beings be forgotten in an excess of affection for animals, she violated her own strictures by humanizing animals. The daily activities of a robin family were described in human terms in order to inspire sympathy for the creatures. To inspire horror and revulsion for cruelty, inhumane acts towards animals, birds, and even insects were described in detail. The creatures suffered like human beings, but had Mrs. Trimmer been more objective, she would have had less chance of inspiring compassion in her readers. It was a harsh age.[84] Animal sports, such as cock fighting and bear baiting which disgust modern sensibilities, were still in existence in Mrs. Trimmer's age. Mrs. Trimmer did refer specifically to cock fighting and throwing at cocks.[85]

In Soffrona and her Cat Muff by Mrs. Sherwood, two little girls playing by a brook happened to see some boys attempting to drown a kitten:

> And they saw the boys stoop over the water and put something into it, and at the same time they heard a very young kitten cry; and the two little girls could not stop themselves from screaming out, quite loud, from the midst of the bushes, saying "Wicked, cruel boys! What are you doing?" Now the boys heard the cries of the little girls; and, as the Bible says, The wicked flee when no man pursueth; (Prov. xxviii. 1) so they all took to their heels, and ran away as fast as they could, leaving the poor little kitten in the water.[86]

The girls rushed into the water and saved the kitten.

Mrs. Sherwood also emphasized that compassion for animals must never stand in the way of that due to fellow human beings. Soffrona was admonished for neglecting her duty to a poor old woman:

> Soffrona was thinking of nothing but Muff all the evening, and she kept her on her lap while she was reading and while she was eating her supper. She was, indeed, so much occupied by her little kitten, that, when the lady /her foster mother/ asked her to help to make a flannel petticoat for a poor old woman who lived in a cottage among the hills, not very far off, she took the needle in her hand, it is true, but I do not think she took twenty stitches; for she was looking down every minute upon the kitten on her lap: and the petticoat would not have been done that night if Sophia had not been doubly diligent....Soffrona's heart was with her kitten, and she could think of nothing else, and of no

> other creature. She had no pity left for the old woman, so much was she thinking of little Muff. We ought to be kind to animals; but our first affections should be given to our Maker, our second to our fellow-creatures, and our third to any poor animals which may be in our power.[87]

Kindness to animals was also emphasized in The Child's Birth-day by Isaac Taylor and Education at Home by Edgar White Benson. In the former book, a little girl wished to capture a beautiful butterfly for her doll to play with:

> Amelia /her sister/. What, spoil it, kill it: would little Mary kill the pretty creature, and make it die.
> Mary. No: I would not kill it, indeed; but I would put it in my little screw box, and give it bread and milk, and meat every day: only for doll to play with it.
> Mamma. But it could not eat bread, or milk, or meat, my love: it lives only on the fine juices which it sucks out of the flowers. It would starve, with all your best care, and die.[88]

In Education at Home the author included a story called "The Story of Myself, the Tortoiseshell Kitten." Here cruelty to animals was severely punished: a boy who mistreated a kitten eventually died when he was kicked by a horse. Happily, the horse was not blamed for his death, for the poor creature was being flogged at the time by the same cruel boy. Justice had been done.

The importance of avoiding evil companions was stressed in many books and stories. In Improvement by Diana Bayley, children were cautioned against capricious, selfish and vain people. These undesirable characteristics could be masked by pleasing manners. The potentially harmful influence of servants was a cause of great concern as well. In The First Theft by Mrs. Marshall, a wicked servant initiated a little girl into the world of crime. In The Family Mansion by Ann Taylor, a young girl was unwisely left to the care of servants who filled her head with romantic ideas. Encouraged by a servant, the girl foolishly eloped with a disreputable man and brought upon herself much grief and misery. In The Little Quaker, the son of a wealthy squire was encouraged by an evil groom to torment a young Quaker boy by teasing his geese, destroying his garden, and letting loose his younger sister's pet rabbits. The groom did, however, meet a nasty end, and the wealthy boy narrowly escaped a similar fate due to the efforts of the Quaker boy. The squire's son repented of his ways and the story did have a happy ending. In Emily and Henrietta the following admonition concerning servants was given to a little girl returning home from the country where she had been taking a cure:

> Let me caution you my dear Emily /said her guardian/, when you return, to keep a distant and polite reserve towards the domestics of your mamma's establishment.... Even treat them with affability--thank them for the attention and obedience to your desires--let your commands wear the air of a request--but let not your condescension and affability towards them degenerate into familiarity with servants. If you do not mix in their idle tattle, and listen only with indifference, and without noticing them, they will be silent before you; but on the contrary, if you once become familiar with such people, you will soon...destroy both your understanding and your heart.[89]

A warning about servants appeared also in The Child's Birth-day:

> Children taught only at set times, and left to themselves at all intervals, will learn most of what they should not. If they associate with servants, when mamma cannot bear their noise and drives them from the parlour, they will learn of servants, servants' ways and servants' notions; and, perhaps, all the mother's precious lesson is rendered abortive by one laugh of Betty the cook; or

> the best advice the father can give, shall be deprived of all influence, by an opportunity to break it, given by Tom the groom. It is certain, that if servants had no vicious propensities, or absurd prejudices, or evil intentions, they, are, by their own want of liberal education, totally unqualified for instructing the children of the family; yet, could the children of the family recollect, and discriminate where, and how, they imbibed the notions which do really influence their apprehensions, and govern their conduct, it would be found, that more than half the effective instruction they received, was obtained from these polluted sources....With voracious appetite, food or poison is swallowed, till the mind's constitution is depraved, and some blotch of mischief, passion, or grosser wickedness, breaks out in the conduct.[90]

As numerous examples presented throughout this thesis have indicated, obedience was one of the most important lessons to be learned. An obedient child fell victim to far fewer vices. Obedience derived from the right kind of education, as the father explained to his sister in The Child's Birth-day:

> Father. Parents must, indeed, educate themselves especially as to temper. The capricious manner in which some parents act, destroys with one hand, all they do with the other. My motto in education is MILD, BUT FIRM. Under the former term, I would recommend the gentleness that a fond mother feels; the insinuating, bland kindness which marks all she does, as the overflowing of affection; that sets no impossible tasks, forces no unnecessary restraints, does not willingly have recourse to severe chastisements; but mingles many a kiss with parental instructions.
> Aunt Dinah. That is very kind, I am sure; but I have seen many children spoiled, by a conduct resembling what you now recommend.
> Father. Then let the other term in my motto, firm, have due consideration and influence. This includes that regularity which never moves from its purpose, and that constancy of exertion which never deserts its post. If I would give no impossible tasks, yet what I do give must be done. If I do not austerely command or restrain, yet my commands must be obeyed, and my restrictions must not be broken through....I mean by firmness, too, that immovable steadiness which is the same one day as another. This caprice which deforms the rule of many parents, and

> the unsteadiness to principle which they show, torment and perplex their children, and make them that they do not know what they are to do. If the rule given out yesterday, may be avoided to-day, there will be a contest about it to-morrow.[91]

Firmness and regularity, not without mildness, then were the essential characteristics of the ideal method of education.[92]

Preoccupation with moral instruction, virtue and vice, led in a number of upper and middle class fictional families to a serious debate about the advantages and disadvantages of public or boarding school education. Many parents, like Mr. Montague in Montague Park, feared the consequences of faulty or inadequate supervision "away from the paternal roof":

> I am averse to the idea of submitting Jane and Emma, at the tender ages of ten and twelve, to the entire superintendence of strangers--away from the paternal roof, and unguided by the tender admonitions of parental affection. I am aware, that too many are very culpable in this respect, frequently transferring their offspring to the care of those, into whose principles, either moral or religious, they have not even had a thought of inquiring.[93]

Fear of moral contamination through exposure to vice, evil companions, was a persistent theme in the literature. For the intrusive parent especially, separation from the child was fraught with pain and anxiety.[94] The parting, if this was the course of education chosen, was invariably tearful and charged with emotion. The tender parent always had cautionary words. In Always Happy!!! by Maria Budden, Felix was told to remember his mother and sister, for the recollection of their virtues would "soften and improve" his character and keep him "in the path of rectitude."[95]

In 1857, forty-three years after *Always Happy!!!* was published, Squire Brown had much the same to say to his son Tom when the latter left for Rugby in that most famous of school boy novels, *Tom Brown's School-days*:

> If schools are what they were in my time, you'll see a great many cruel blackguard things done, and hear a deal of foul bad talk. But never fear. You tell the truth, keep a brave and kind heart, and never listen to or say anything you wouldn't have your mother or sister hear, and you'll never feel ashamed to come home, or we to see you.[96]

Criticism of the moral state of the public schools was not new in the early nineteenth century. In *Some Thoughts Concerning Education*, John Locke considered the problem of a private education at home with a tutor, versus a boarding school education for a young gentleman, and concluded that

> the faults of a privater education [are] infinitely to be preferred [to the improvements of a public education]; and [a father] will take care to preserve his child's innocence and modesty at home, as being nearer of kin, and more in the way of those qualities, which make a useful and able man.[97]

Inadequate supervision and moral contamination were the arguments repeated in the didactic literature against a public or boarding school education. In *The Sister's Friend* by Mrs. Cameron, a mother stated:

> Where boys are educated in public, and indeed, we may often add, private schools...their religious instruction is frequently neglected, or superficially given; and even where tutors take the most pains, their instructions must generally want application; for who can know a child's heart like the parents who have watched over him from the cradle; besides, who can tell what boys may learn from bad companions: and all this...is frequently, though in a much slighter degree, the case in girls' schools. Fathers and mothers, and sisters too, should always remember these things; and though it does not do to talk long to school-boys and girls, who are too often

> of a very restless spirit, yet a word in season, how good it is; and occasional earnest appeals to the conscience ought to be given, and will be attended to in most cases. But...all this will do no good, unless home is made pleasant, and unless those persons who reprove them, whether gaily or gravely, set a good example before them.[98]

Religion and morality were also the focus of Lady Seymour's words to little Charles as he prepared to go to a boarding school in Sophia another book by Mrs. Camerson:

> A school is a little world in [an] important respect. The language of Canaan is not talked among the generality of men: on the contrary true religion and religious people are ridiculed, and, sometimes, even strict morality will be so too. And this you will find to be the case among your new companions. Some boys will not only do wickedly themselves but will strive to make you as bad as themselves, and will laugh at you, and perhaps beat you, and call you names, if you do not fall in with their views. Here, nothing but the grace of God can preserve you from joining a multitude to do evil. But be cautious of opposing even these wicked children in a wrong spirit. Let Christian courage make you firm in opposing, and Christian humility meek and gentle. If your companions cannot ruffle or discompose your temper, they will in time cease to torment you....[99]

Charles's mother hoped that her son, through diligence and industry would "get forward in the school" and would "obtain that situation in it, which will give you influence, and will enable you to promote the cause of virtue by precept as well as example." She added:

> From our cradle it is appointed to the children of Christian parents to fight manfully in the spiritual warfare. Many are the battles of this kind you will be called to fight at school: but there are many now in heaven who were enabled to be more than conquerors through the Captain of their Salvation, even during the days of their childhood, and in the very same situation in which you are now going to be placed. O, my Charles, may you be one of that holy generation who are as burning and shining lights in the midst of a crooked and perverse generation. But remember, that prayer at least twice a day and on every occasion of need, reading the Bible daily, and employing the Sunday properly,

> are means you must use, whatever ridicule they may expose you to.[100]

There was just cause for this concern about moral corruption in the public schools of the early nineteenth century. Numerous accounts attest to the violence, brutality, and, of course, vice prevalent in the public schools.[101] So deplorable in fact were the conditions that school boy rebellions were not uncommon in the latter years of the eighteenth and early years of the nineteenth century.[102] The rebellions continued into the 1830's and enrollment declined in many of the great schools during the pre-Victorian period.

Although some middle and upper class boys and girls in the literature did attend the great public schools or other élite boarding schools, a greater number, it will be recalled, received a "privater" education at home, reflecting no doubt society's concern with vice and moral contamination.

Interestingly, in the literature, the boarding school was sometimes seen as a last resort, a grave punishment for uncontrollable or unruly children. Examples of this occured in The History of Little Frank and his Sister by Mrs. Cameron, The History of William Selwyn by Elizabeth Sandham, The Advantages of Education Elucidated, Education at Home by Edgar White Benson, and A Mother's Care Rewarded by Mary Hughes. In the latter book, Caroline was a vain, indolent girl, given to fits of passion. Her mother threatened her with the prospect of being sent away to school several times. At one point the mother stated:

> I fear you want a more strict preceptress than your mother can ever be: unremitting attention is what you must have but which, in the present state of my affairs, I cannot pay you....
> It is the superintendence of one accustomed to the education of youth that you require--one who gives her whole time to her pupils, and who, while she gently and kindly leads you to do what is right, will both reprimand and punish you when you do wrong.[103]

The advantages and disadvantages of a public school or boarding school education did not of course concern the lower class. Social class determined the availability of education, and the curriculum and method of instruction. There was very little specific discussion about the education of lower class or poor children in the literature. There were references to charity schools, Sunday schools, and schools of industry, but almost no description of curriculum and method used. This lack may be explained in part at least by the fact that the majority of stories were about upper and middle class families. The didactic authors were themselves members of these classes, as were their readers.

The best examples of lower class education occured in The History of Goody Two-Shoes and The Factory Girl. In the former book, little Goody, a very poor girl who could not go to school, learned to read by borrowing the books of more fortunate children. "By this means," the author wrote, "she soon got more learning than any of her Playmates, and laid the following Scheme for instructing those who were more ignorant than herself":

> She found that only the following Letters were required to spell all the Words in the World; but as some of these Letters are large and some small, she with her

> Knife cut out of several Pieces of Wood ten Setts of each of these:
>
> a b c d e f g h i j k l m n o p q r s t u v
> w x y z.
>
> And six Setts of these:
>
> A B C D E F G H I J K L M N O P Q R S T U V
> W X Y Z.
>
> And having got an old Spelling-Book, she made her Companions set up all the Words they wanted to spell, and after that she taught them to compose Sentences.... The usual Manner of Spelling, or carrying on the Game, as they called it, was this: Suppose the Word to be spelt was Plumb Pudding (and who can suppose a better) the Children were placed in a Circle, and the first brought the Letter P, the next l, the next u, the next m, and so on till the Whole was spelt; and if any one brought a wrong Letter, he was to pay a Fine, or play no more. This was at their Play; and every Morning she used to go round to teach the Children with these Rattle-traps in a Basket....[104]

Little Goody became known as a "trotting tutoress."

In The Factory Girl, Mary, a devout girl of eighteen, organized a Sunday school for the boys and girls who worked with her in the factory. The author described her class as follows:

> The method she adopted, was to receive the children in the public school-house on Sunday, between the morning and evening divine service. The first exercise was an account, from the six eldest, of the text, divisions, etc. of the morning sermon; the one who excelled was rewarded by the honourable office of assistant and aided in preserving order, and performing many little services which Mary had the talent of rendering highly desirable. This was followed by a recitation of the lessons they had been required to get in the preceding week, which consisted of select passages of Scripture with a certain number of words which they had learned to spell in their intervals of labour. To this succeeded reading in rotation from the New Testament, each four or five verses; and all was closed by a short, appropriate prayer which Mr. Seymore had written and given to Mary to read on that occasion. She found little difficulty in governing, for she ruled her scholars with love. Proudly

> happy, indeed, was the favoured one, who received from her the reward of a flower, which was worn in triumph at the factory on the succeeding Monday, and afterwards carefully preserved as long as possible.[105]

Religious instruction similar to that described in The Factory Girl was the major focus of schools for the poor at this time. As Hannah More, an important figure in the Sunday school movement as well as a prolific author believed, the purpose of Sunday schools and other schools for the poor was "to train up the poor in habits of industry and piety."[106]

III. Recreation

1. Introduction

As stated in the introduction of this chapter, the pre-Victorians had less difficulty than might be expected in seeing a relationship between education and recreation. They liked educational games, useful knowledge, and creative play. Many activities described in the literature could be considered both educational and recreational. Gardening and reading for example, could be considered part of either category. In the former activity, children were expected not only to amuse themselves outdoors, but also to learn something about botany, industry, and responsibility. Similarly, reading was a popular leisure activity, but in many fictional families, serious improving literature was all that was available. As moral and religious instruction was incorporated into most subjects in the curriculum, so didacticism infused most recreational activities.

Because children were the focus of the books and stories written for them, this examination of recreation will begin with a discussion of children's recreational activities. The location of children's play and choice of playmates will be considered first.

2. Children's Place of Recreation and Choice of Playmates

As noted in the previous chapter, by far the majority of fictional children, both boys and girls, played both at home and in the community. These figures, referring to numbers of families, were 58 out of a possible 69 families for boys, and 73 out of 85 for girls. Information about the location of recreation could not be determined for 50 and 34 families for boys and girls respectively.

Despite the fact that few children played primarily at home, the majority of children played more with their siblings than with relatives, neighbors, or classmates. Table 11 indicates the possible relationships.

The Fairchild children seldom played with other children but amused themselves with one another. Henry did form a brief friendship with pious little Charles Trueman when he was in disgrace with his father for refusing to learn his Latin. Charles was instrumental in convincing Henry he should beg his father's forgiveness. Unfortunately, however, the friendship did not last for Charles soon died a happy death. On another occasion, the three children spent some time with the children of Sir Charles and Lady Noble. But these children were haughty, ill-mannered, and irreligious. Needless to say, friendship was not encouraged, and the Fairchild children played with the Noble children only when Sir Charles and Lady Noble invited the Fairchild family to dinner twice a year, as was the wealthy couple's custom.

TABLE 11

CHILDREN'S CHOICE OF PLAYMATES

	Playmates--Boys Number of Families	Playmates--Girls Number of Families
Siblings primarily	32	34
Relatives primarily	1	2
Siblings, relatives	4	5
Neighbors primarily	1	7
Siblings, relatives, neighbors	12	15
Siblings, neighbors	9	10
Neighbors, classmates	3	2
Siblings, neighbors, classmates	5	4
Classmates primarily	0	3
Siblings, relatives, classmates	1	0
Siblings, classmates	2	2
Relatives, neighbors, classmates	2	1
Relatives, neighbors	0	2
All	5	3
N/A N/G	42	29
Total	119	119

Similarly, the Benson children in Fabulous Histories rarely played with other children. Those occasions they did play with other children were not pleasant, for in contrast to the Benson children, other children were rough, ill-mannered, and cruel. On one occasion indeed, the Benson children were reduced to tears by a certain Master Jenkin's stories of his cruelty to animals.

The two little sisters, Sophia and Soffrona, in Soffrona and her Cat Muff also played exclusively together:

> Sophia was one year older than Soffrona; and Sophia and Soffrona learned lessons together, and played together, and were very happy in each other's company. When you saw Soffrona, you might be sure Sophia was not very far off; and when you saw Sophia, it was very certain that Soffrona was at no great distance.[107]

In The Warren Family by S. W., brothers and sisters played primarily with one another:

> Of a morning they /the eldest girls/ knew that their time must be spent attending to their own lessons, and instructing their brother and sister, but in the afternoon their mother generally allowed them two hours to spend as they pleased and took care, if she could to keep the younger children away from them, that they might not then be interrupted....
> Sometimes they attempted to draw landscapes, an employment which they were both fond of; or one would draw, whilst the other read an entertaining book. Sometimes they had a letter to write to an aunt, or a cousin at a distance; and some days they amused themselves with doing fancy work, or making boxes, card racks, etc. in a neat manner, as presents for some of their friends. But the limited two hours were rarely exceeded, as their mother wished them afterwards to play in the garden, or walk out with their brothers and sisters; or, if the weather was bad, to skip, or take some exercise in the house.[108]

Children who played primarily with relatives, neighbors, or classmates rather than primarily with siblings did so because of unusual circumstances. For example, in A Visit to the Farm by James Bishop, George had no choice but to play with his cousin for he had been sent away from his home in the city to live on his grandfather's farm in order that he might recover his health. In The Factory Girl, and The First Theft by Mrs. Marshall, the girls had no siblings and by necessity played with neighbors and classmates respectively. In neither story was there any indication that relatives might live close by. Those children who were sent away to school for the greater part of the story of course played primarily with classmates.

Social class appeared not to be an important factor in the location of children's play or choice of playmates. All social classes were fairly represented among those who played primarily with siblings, and the numbers in most other categories were not large enough to permit a reasonable representation of any class.

3. Children's Recreational Activities

A variety of recreational activities were available to both boys and girls in the literature. Among boys, the most popular activites were reading, walking, and story-telling. Girls enjoyed reading, walking, and playing with dolls. Reading was by far the most popular activity among both sexes, and in most cases the books chosen were "improving," serious, and educational. Walking was a more popular form of recreation in the nineteenth century than it is today. It could be considered a serious and improving activity too, for it could contribute to both physical and spiritual health. In Education at Home Mr. Hervey spoke of its benefits and admitted it to his restricted list of permissible Sunday activities:

> ...a person may think or read when walking, as well as sitting...perhaps better, for if you remember, "Isaac walked out at eventide to meditate," but, when not engaged in proper conversation when walking, to prevent the attention being diverted, and the thoughts dissipated by the objects around, I would always recommend you to read.[109]

The Fairchild family regularly enjoyed a walk together. Very often a walk was supplemented by a picnic as in the following passage:

> The next morning early, the children got everything ready to go into the Primrose Meadow. They had each of them a little basket, with a lid to it, in which they packed up their work and their new books: and as soon as the family had breakfasted, they set out for the Primrose Meadow--Mr. Fairchild with a book in his pocket for his own reading; Mrs. Fairchild with her work-bag hanging on her arm; and Betty with a large basket of bread and cheese, and a large cold fruit pie; and the children with their baskets and Emily's doll, for the little girls seldom went out without their doll.[110]

This passage illustrates a number of activities--walking, picnicing, reading, playing with a doll, and working. Mrs. Fairchild and the little girls brought their sewing. Recreation was thus made serious and improving as well as pleasurable.

Boys and girls in the literature shared many games, toys, and activities. Nonetheless, a good number of toys and activities were thought to be more appropriate to one sex than the other. Boys, for example, played more with "batts" and balls than with dolls and "baby houses." But as the following list of children's recreational activites indicates, there was a considerable amount of overlapping.

TABLE 12

CHILDREN'S RECREATIONAL ACTIVITIES-- GAMES, TOYS, PASTIMES, HOBBIES

Boys	Girls
Reading	Reading
Swings	Swings
Picnics	Picnics
Excursions	Excursions
Playing with pets	Playing with pets
Stuffed birds	Dolls
Visiting	Visiting
Walking	Walking
Story-telling	Story-telling
Gardening	Gardening
Fishing	House
Fairs	Toy furniture
Batt and Ball	Ball
Skating	Skating
Skipping	Skipping
Picking flowers	Picking flowers
Dancing	Dancing
Cards	Cards
Blind-man's bluff	Blind-man's bluff
Leap frog	Leap frog
Music	Music
Parties	Parties
Fox and geese	Fox and geese
Drawing	Drawing
Sailing	Sailing
Shuttlecock and battledore	Shuttlecock and battledore
Skipping rope	Skipping rope
Whips	Whips
Tops	Tops

Table 12 continued:

Boys	Girls
"Man of War"	Baby houses
Rocking horse	Rocking horse
Toy ships	Toy ships
Kites	Doll's bed
Riding	Riding
Carpentry	Sewing
Theatre	Theatre
Nutting	Nutting
Books	Books
Organ	Organ
Harp	Harp
Sliding on ice	Sliding on ice
Toy horses	Toy horses
Marbles	Doll's cart
Painting	Painting
Running	Running
Swimming	Collecting shells
Foot ball	Chess
Archery	Hide and seek
Riddles	Playing in the woods
Poetry	Poetry
Cricket	Bazaars
Shooting	Piano
Hoops	Guitar
Nine pins	Violin
Rowing	Tambourine
Flinging at cocks	Flute

The game shuttlecock and battledore was, as the table indicates, a game played by both girls and boys. In The Sister's Friend by Mrs. Cameron, and Isabella by H. S. (1825)

for example, the brothers and sisters played the game together. A forerunner of badminton, this game had educational and improving properties. The battledore originally consisted of a wooden frame covered with a sheet of parchment inscribed with lessons. The shuttlecock was a light object, usually a cork stuck with feathers. The battledore, although properly a game piece, became more useful as an educational tool than the horn book which had been in use since the Middle Ages. The latter consisted of a single sheet of parchment inscribed with lessons and fastened on a wooden board. The later battledore was made of stiff paper which could be folded and made to provide more information than the horn book. The information or lessons usually consisted of pictorial alphabets, simple sentences and stories, rhymes, and prayers.[111]

Gathering nuts or "nutting" was another activity enjoyed by both sexes in Sincerity: A Tale (1824), Soffrona and her Cat Muff and The History of Henry Milner by Mrs. Sherwood, and The Truant Reclaimed by Mary Elliot. In the latter book the author provided a dark moral lesson for those children who preferred to play than to go to school. Arthur disliked school very much and decided one day to play truant and go nutting. He was not long in regretting his folly, for a series of disasters rapidly befell him; his books were stolen by gipsies, he was caught in the rain, and in the end, a naughty boy took his hard earned nuts and threw them in the river. Interestingly, the boy who threw Arthur's nuts away was a dunce who would not go to school. As if these misfortunes were not enough to deter any child from repeating the adventure, Arthur encountered an old man who gave him wise advice and told him about the fatal effects of truancy.

> "I grieve [said the old man] when I hear of children going a nutting; it is an idle pursuit and leads to mischief. At your age school is the best place at this hour in the day, there you may gather nuts worth cracking, and find the kernal ripe with learning....Once.... I had a little boy much about your age; he was a clever child too, and might have learned any thing, if he had liked to do so; but he was idle, and loved all things better than his book; and then he used to go a nutting without my leave, and when I reproved him, he only laughed and went nutting again...."
>
> "But," said Arthur, in a timid voice, "was he not sorry when he grew older, and did he not mind you then?"
>
> "No, no," cried the stranger, "when children neglect their learning, and will have their own way, it is not easy to bring them back to the right path; my boy went on his wild course, mixing with bad people, and not caring for his poor father until at last he became a poacher....One night he was caught in a snare set for rogues, and was sent to a prison, where he died of a fever....Ah! Children who dislike school never turn out well."[112]

Uncontrolled, self-indulgent recreation was thus no better than simple idleness. Idleness leads to mischief, the old man told Arthur, or as Mr. Hervey in Education at Home said when he took his sons to visit a prison, "Idleness is the root of all evil."

Closely akin to nutting was playing in the woods. A delightful description of this activity occurred in Soffrona and her Cat Muff by Mrs. Sherwood:

> Soffrona and Sophia lived in a very lovely house, surrounded with woods....Soffrona and Sophia were allowed to play in these woods, and they had learned to run and skip upon the hills like young fawns. It was very pleasing to see them, and they found many treasures in those wild places which children who have never been in woods have no idea of. They found snail-shells, and

> painting-stones, and wild strawberries, and bilberries, and walnuts, and hazel nuts, and beautiful moss, and many kinds of flowers; and there they heard birds sing --cuckoos, and linnets, and blackbirds, and thrushes; and saw beautiful butterflies with gold and purple plumes, and dragon-flies, whose wings look like fine silk net.[113]

Swinging was a popular activity in a number of books and stories. In The History of the Fairchild Family, an illicit bout on the swing in Mr. Fairchild's barn nearly resulted in tragedy. One day, the children were playing by themselves in the barn:

> Henry spied a swing, which Mr. Fairchild had made in the barn for the children, but which he never allowed them to use when he was not with them, because swings are very dangerous things unless there are very careful persons to use them. The seat of the swing was tied up to the side of the barn, above the children's reach, as Mr. Fairchild thought.[114]

The children managed, however, to get the swing down, and amused themselves for some time with it. Eventually, they became restless, and swung Emily higher and higher

> till at last the swing turned, and down came Emily on the floor! There happened, by the goodness of God, to be some straw on the floor or she would have been killed. As it was, however, she was sadly hurt: she lay for some minutes without speaking, and her mouth and nose poured out blood.[115]

Fortunately, Emily was not severely injured, and the children were very sorry for their disobedience.

Dolls were generally considered girls' toys, but some very little boys played with dolls, as in Mamma's Stories. The wealthier the child's family, the finer the doll. The upper class child's doll of course had all manner of comforts, including clothes, furniture, cradles, carts, and houses.

Mrs. Sherwood took pains to describe a "baby-house" for those poor children in India and England who had never seen one in The History of the Fairchild Family:

> It is a small house, fit for dolls, with door and windows, and chimney outside; and inside there is generally a parlour and a kitchen, and a bed-room with chairs, tables, couches, beds, carpets, and everything small, just as there is in a real house for people to live in.[116]

The Fairchild girls had no such fine house, but their wealthy neighbor Augusta Noble did.

Dolls and other toys were hardly denied fictional children but they appeared to be slightly suspect, for they could encourage the growth of such vices as envy, greed, and pride. For example, when Emily Fairchild received a beautiful doll from Lady Noble as a reward for finding that lady's diamond ring, Mr. Fairchild "was not quite so much over joyed as his daughter." He foresaw the dissension it would cause in his household:

> Emily ran...to her mamma and sister and brother, and taking the paper off the doll cried out, "How beautiful! O what pretty hands! What nice feet! What blue eyes! How lovely! How beautiful!"
> Her mamma asked her several times where she had got this pretty doll, but Emily was too busy to answer her.... When Emily had unpacked the doll, she opened the box, which was full of as pretty doll's things as ever you saw. Whilst Emily was examining all these things, Henry stood admiring them and turning them about; but Lucy, after having once looked at the doll without touching it, went to a corner of the room, and sat down in her little chair without speaking a word.[117]

Lucy was plainly envious of her sister. Her mother, observing her behavior carefully, took Lucy aside, convinced her that her heart was wicked, that envy was a wicked and sinful passion, and finally

> took Lucy by the hand and went into her closet; where they prayed that God would take the wicked passion of envy out of Lucy's heart by sending his Holy Spirit into it....[118]

Similar incidents of children quarrelling over toys occurred in The Little Wranglers by Mary Elliot and Always Happy!!! by Maria Budden. In the former book, a brother and sister quarrelled violently over a handsome rocking horse that was given to the brother for his birthday. The brother was severely injured in the quarrel, and the rocking horse was taken away. As unfortunate as the incident was, it did have beneficial results, for the children learned a valuable lesson and ceased their habitual quarrelling. In Always Happy!!! Felix and Serena, two very loving children, witnessed the shocking behavior of their cousins quarrelling over toys. "What sight can be more shocking!" the author exclaimed. "Four brothers and sisters, fighting and beating each other!--Poor Serena turned pale with fear...."[119]

Active games like blind-man's bluff, fox and geese, hide-and-seek, and leap frog were played by both sexes in The History of Little Frank and his Sister and The Sister's Friend by Mrs. Cameron, Claudine by Maria Budden, The Coral Necklace by Sarah Wilson (1830), and Mary Campbell. Skipping was popular with boys and girls in Always Happy!!!, The History of Henry Milner by Mrs. Sherwood, The Daughter-in-law, her Father and Family by Barbara Hofland, and The Warren Family by S. W. Skipping ropes were used but no skipping rhymes were recorded. Running, jumping, and dancing were also popular.

Parties and balls were surprisingly common, given the Evangelical tenor of the majority of books and stories examined. Many families, however, who encouraged these activities among children or young people were considered frivolous or ungodly. Some authors considered dances less dangerous and therefore permissible when enjoyed at home in the company of close friends and family rather than in a public place. Mrs. Adams in The Good Mother's Legacy by Hannah More, discouraged her children from joining any "revelling" or "merry-making" in the parish, but "as a reward for their dutiful behavior, she often made some little entertainment for them at home, and gave them the liberty also of inviting some of their friends." As the good mother said:

> I love to see young people cheerful and happy, but I tremble to have them dancing in ale-houses, which takes away their modesty--or getting drunk, which turns them into brutes--or phrophanely /sic/ cursing and swearing to the endangering of their immortal souls.[120]

Dancing and merry-making in the parish was not always condemned. In Claudine, a story set in Switzerland by Maria Budden, the virtuous Claudine and the good villagers enjoyed dancing at a village wedding and suffered no fatal effects.

Music was a popular pastime, and although it was emphasized as an important part of middle and upper class female education, boys as well as girls enjoyed singing and playing instruments. The instruments mentioned in the literature were the piano, violin, harp, flute, guitar, and tambourine. Certain instruments, such as the piano, were of course restricted to certain classes because of their cost. The tambourine on the other hand, was played by Swiss peasants in Claudine.

Drawing and painting too were considered part of the middle and upper class girl's curriculum as "accomplishments," but they were also considered leisure activities for both sexes. It will be recalled that the Warren girls in The Warren Family by S. W. liked to draw landscapes during their leisure time. In The Fruits of Education by Mrs. Cameron, little James, who was raised apart from his sister by a godly uncle, preferred to draw than play cribbage with his sister and a maid. Drawing was considered much less harmful for children.

Card playing in general was condemned because it was associated with gambling. The Fairchild family, for example, ended their visit at Sir Charles and Lady Noble's as soon as the company began to play cards. In a few cases, card playing was permitted for children, but only if the card game was an educational one. In The Spoiled Child Reclaimed by Mary Rodwell (1835), a geography game was played with cards.

Toy or model ships and kites were considered boy's toys. The best example of the former occurred in The Sister's Friend by Mrs. Cameron. The Shirley boys had a "man of war" which could sail on a large pool." A very fine kite was described and illustrated in The Holiday Present by Dorothy Kilner:

> The kite was almost as big as Tom so that when he put it upon his back it quite hid him, and the kite looked as if it walked alone. Look here is a picture of Tom going home with the kite upon his back.[121]

The kite was indeed almost as big as Tom as the accompanying woodcut faithfully illustrated. Charles, the boy for whom the kite was intended as a gift, did not have the opportunity to play with it. His father had tied him up for being naughty and rude.

In The Holiday Present the Jennet children were given the opportunity to play with a number of toys in "the good child's box" if they were good. The box, which was kept locked at all times, was filled with "books, bats, balls, kites, nine pins, marbles, work bags, housewifes, dolls, boxes, and a great variety of pretty things."[122]

Many children had pets which occupied a good deal of their time. Kittens, puppies, and rabbits were the most common pets. Pets were not only playmates for children, keeping and caring for pets also taught children lessons of responsibility, kindness, and charity, as examples from Fabulous Histories and Soffrona and her Cat Muff have shown.

As the list of activities and examples provided have indicated, fictional children did not lack toys or ways to spend leisure hours. Throughout the literature, however, there was a prevailing sense that recreation had to be controlled, supervised, made useful and improving. Children rarely played freely and without purpose. Recreational time was limited by lessons, duties, and work. It would seem that didactic authors, and presumably pre-Victorian parents, had come to accept the idea that recreation was healthful, necessary for the refreshment of both mind and body, but could not quite dissociate recreation from idleness, frivolity, and ultimately, sin.

Social class did have an effect on the recreational activities of children presented in the literature. No lower class girls had dolls, baby houses, or toy furniture, played the piano, the harp, or the flute, or drew or painted landscapes, and no lower class boys had a man of war, skates, a rocking horse, or went riding or shooting. Overall, there was little information in the literature about the recreational activities of lower class children. Their activities, where given, were very simple: walking, picnicing, picking flowers, playing in the forest, playing with pets, sewing, and nutting. It will be recalled that Mrs. Adams, the good mother represented in Hannah More's book, The Good Mother's Legacy, provided entertainment for her children at home to discourage them from spending their leisure time in the ale-house.

4. Approved Reading Material for Children

Reading can be discussed under both education and recreation for it is an important part of both activities. It is discussed here under recreation because it was easily one of the most popular leisure activities.[123] Approved reading material was grouped under the following main categories: religious, didactic, classics, fantasy. There were also combinations of these categories. Religious material included sermons, tracts, the Bible, theology, and religious biographies.

Didactic literature generally included some religious content--prayers, hymns, sermons, passages from the Scriptures, but presented in story form. The History of the Fairchild

Family is an excellent example of didactic literature. Every chapter ended with a prayer and a hymn, and most included passages from the Bible. No opportunity was missed to tell a religious tale or present religious strictures. Moral instruction, difficult to separate from religious instruction during this period of history, was an essential part of this kind of literature. The purpose of didactic literature was to teach religious and moral values. Some didactic authors managed to do this more pleasantly than others.

Classics consisted of Greek and Latin literature. Usually this literature was read in the original language, but occasionally, especially among girls, who did not as a rule study Greek and Latin, it was read in translation. No fictional child appeared to read this kind of literature for pure enjoyment. As Mrs. Sherwood wrote when Henry began to learn Latin in The History of the Fairchild Family, "Latin is a very difficult language, and requires many hours of hard labour before any little boy can master it." But a knowledge of classical languages was necessary for any boy who was to become a clergyman, as Henry was, and among the upper and middle classes, a classical education was expected.

Fantasy literature included fairy tales, animal stories that had no definite didactic message, romances, and so-called "penny dreadfuls" or cheap, sensational novels. Needless to say, this kind of literature did not have the approval of the didactic authors. The following table indicates the popularity of each category of literature for boys and girls:

TABLE 13

APPROVED READING MATERIAL FOR CHILDREN

Type of Literature	Boys Number of Families	Girls Number of Families
Religious only	1	2
Didactic only	1	1
Classics only	0	0
Fantasy only	0	1
Religious/didactic	29	58
Religious/didactic/ classics	32	16
Religious/didactic/ classics/fantasy	11	10
Religious/didactic/ fantasy	0	1
Didactic/classics	0	0
Didactic/classics/ fantasy	0	0
N/A N/G	45	30
Total	119	119

It will be noted that the approved reading material for each sex differed with a greater proportion of boys reading classical literature than girls. No doubt this reflects the prevailing attitude toward female education in the nineteenth century--"such deep studies, classics, mathematics, that kind of thing, are too taxing for a woman--too taxing, you know," and the important place classics had in the education of a gentleman.[124]

Except in the case of classical literature, there appeared to be no definite relationship between approved reading material and social class. With one important exception, no lower class child of either sex read classical literature along with religious, didactic, or fantasy literature. The one exception occurred in The Scottish Orphans by Isabella Stoddart. The children in this book were actually of noble parentage but had been adopted by a humble family. When the children's true circumstances were discovered, the boys were provided with a gentleman's education. The majority of children of both sexes read religious/didactic literature, and given the total number of families in each class and the upper and upper-middle class bias towards classical literature, the social class representation in the religious/didactic category was not uneven. Tables 14 and 15 illustrate the social class relationships.

The approved reading material for children was indicated directly and indirectly in the literature, that is, by a direct statement by the author or a central figure in the story, or indirectly through descriptions of the books "good" or "bad" children read. A good example of a direct statement of approved reading material for an eleven year old boy occurred in The History of Henry Milner:

> With respect to reading for amusement, Mr. Dalben allowed him this pleasure every day, but he only gave him one book at a time, and required him when he returned it to give some little account of what he had read, and was very particular in pointing out to him the difference between books of instruction and mere amusement, telling him that those volumes such as the Fairy Tales, or the

TABLE 14

APPROVED READING MATERIAL FOR BOYS

Type of Literature	Social Class of Family*			
	Upper	Middle	Lower	Total
Religious only	0	1	0	1
Didactic only	0	1	0	1
Classics only	0	0	0	0
Fantasy only	0	0	0	0
Religious/didactic	5	13	11	29
Religious/didactic/classics	7	24	1	32
Religious/didactic/classics fantasy	8	3	0	11
Religious/didactic/fantasy	0	0	0	0
Didactic/classics/fantasy	0	0	0	0

TABLE 15

APPROVED READING MATERIAL FOR GIRLS

Type of Literature	Social Class of Family*			
	Upper	Middle	Lower	Total
Religious only	1	1	0	2
Didactic only	0	1	0	1
Classics only	0	0	0	0
Fantasy only	0	1	0	1
Religious/didactic	11	30	17	58
Religious/didactic/classics	6	10	0	16
Religious/didactic/classics fantasy	7	3	0	10
Religious/didactic/fantasy	0	1	0	1
Didactic/classics/fantasy	0	0	0	0

*The total number of families represented in each social class was: lower class 21, middle class 67, upper class 31.

> History of Sinbad the Sailor, which contained wonders and prodigies contrary to nature, were not to be believed, neither was any book to be credited or trusted which upheld any thing contrary to the Bible, and no character in history or common life to be admired which did not act according to the rules laid down in Scripture; and thus, he, by degrees, taught the little boy to judge for himself, and to choose the good and eschew the evil.[125]

Fairy tales and books of "mere amusement" were particularly discouraged on the Sabbath in The Sister's Friend by Mrs. Cameron. It will be recalled that Lucy was horrified to find her brother William reading a book of fairy tales on Sunday, and "with unaffected gravity she said to him, "Oh, William, how can you spend the golden hours of Sunday in such a way as this!"

Approved reading material was described by the authors in The Visit by Miss Grierson and The Holiday Present by Dorothy Kilner. In the former book, the narrator noticed the books given to children at a charity school: "the elegant Watts and the accomplished Addison, as well as the more recent names of Marks, More, and Sherwood, together with other eminent authors."[126] In The Holiday Present, the author provided a list of books for children. All were approved books for they came out of the "good child's box" and were given as rewards for good behavior. As the author explained:

> For the whole week following the arrival of the two boxes, all the Miss and Master Jennets behaved extremely well indeed; so that their papa and mamma thought proper to reward them out of the good child's box, as it was called, the other being named the naughty child's box; and as they thought books would not only amuse, but at the same time instruct them, they gave each of

> them a book. To Master George, they gave one intitled [sic] William Sedley: to Miss Maria, the Adventures of a Pincushion: to Charles, the Careful Parent's Gift: to Charlotte, the History of Jemima Placid: to Harriet, the First Principles of Religion adapted to the infant Mind: and to Thomas, the History of a great many little Boys and Girls: all of them very pretty, entertaining, instructive books, very well worth your reading, and sold by Mr. Marshall, Aldermary Church Yard, and by all the booksellers. This particular direction is given, in case any good little children should wish to read them, and not know where to buy them; and, no doubt, their papas and mammas will willingly assist them in the purchase, if they will take pains with their reading, and mind the good advice which is given in those pretty books.[127]

It is important to note once again the emphasis on the instructive qualities of these books. Here, as in The History of Henry Milner, books of "mere amusement" were not considered suitable for children. It is interesting to note too that the books, "all of them very pretty, entertaining, instructive books, very well worth your reading" were written by the author of The Holiday Present, Dorothy Kilner, or her sister, Mary Jane.[128]

Instructive and improving books were also chosen for the Fairchild children. When the good servant John went to the fair, he was instructed to bring back books for each of the children. His choice pleased both the children and their parents:

> "Indeed, John, you are very good," said the children: "what beautiful books!"
> "Here is a number of pictures in mine," said Henry: "it is about a covetous woman--'The History of the Covetous Woman:' I never read that story before."
> "My book," said Emily, "is 'The History of the Orphan Boy:' and there are a great many pictures in it: the first is the picture of the funeral of the poor little boy's papa or mamma, I suppose."
> "Let me see, let me see," said Henry: "O how pretty!

> And what's your book, Lucy?"
> "There are not many pictures in my book," said Lucy: "but there is one at the beginning: it is the picture of a little boy reading to somebody lying in a bed; and there is a lady sitting by. The name of my book is, 'The History of the Good Child, who, by God's blessing, turned his Father and Mother to Christ'."
> "Oh! that must be very pretty!" said Henry.
> By this time Mr. and Mrs. Fairchild were come up: "Oh, Papa! Oh, Mamma!" said the little ones, "what beautiful books John has brought!"
> "Indeed," said Mr. Fairchild when he had looked at them a little while, "they appear to be very nice books: I see they are written in the fear of God; and the pictures in them are very pretty."
> "Henry shall read them to us, my dears," said Mrs. Fairchild, "whilst we sit at work: I should like to hear them very much."[129]

The three books were indeed written in the fear of God. They contained moral and religious instruction and concluded with prayers and hymns. Little Henry also read some classics for he was learning Latin to enable him to become a clergyman.

As the tables and examples have shown, the approved reading material for children in the literature was balanced heavily toward the religious and didactic. A considerable number of upper and middle class boys included classics along with religious/didactic for social and professional reasons. Fantasy literature, that is, fairy tales, romance, adventure, books of "mere amusement" were not generally approved of. Those children who indulged in such literature, either through faulty supervision on the part of their parents or their own wilfulness, often suffered for their folly, as in The Family Mansion by Ann Taylor. In this book, frivolous novels so filled a younger girl's head with romantic ideas that she unwisely eloped with an unscrupulous man. In The Little Quaker, reading frivolous literature was only one of a number of unpleasant things George indulged in. He was cruel, dishonest, and indolent. After suffering severe misfortune, George did repent of his ways, but the fact that such a character enjoyed fantasy literature hardly recommended it.

It would be wrong to suggest that fantasy literature was not read and enjoyed by pre-Victorian children. There is ample evidence that it enjoyed a certain popularity, and collections such as the Osborne offer physical proof that it was available. Not all parents, even fictional parents condemned it outright. Some permitted it in moderation or under supervision, and only definitely prohibited it on Sundays. In The Sister's Friend by Mrs. Cameron, Lucy was horrified that her brother was reading fairy tales on Sunday, a day set aside in religious families for seriousness and contemplation. It is by no means certain that Lucy would have been so horrified had she found her brother reading such literature on another day. But religious/didactic literature predominated in the literature for both children and adults in this period of history. The great period of fantasy literature, however, was not that far away.

5. Degree of Adult Involvement in Children's Recreation

The majority of adults in the literature, including parents, foster parents, relatives, governesses, tutors, and nurses, were interested in the recreational activities of their charges. Not many adults, however, could be considered highly involved in children's play. In only 2 families for boys and 4 families for girls could the adults be described in this way. In The History of Little Henry and his Bearer by Mrs. Sherwood, the adult who was highly involved in his charge's play was "Boosy," Henry's native servant or "bearer." Boosy was really the only companion little Henry had for the greater part of the story, for Henry was an orphan who had been brought to live in the house of a wealthy lady. Boosy was a devoted servant, guardian, and friend to the lonely little boy. In The Good Aunt by Harriet Ventum, an aunt, hoping to correct the evil influence of an incompetent governess, spent an extraordinary amount of time with her two nieces. She did more than simply supervise the girls. She actually joined in their recreation which was walking, reading, and visiting. Such a high degree of involvement, however, in which the adult was the constant companion of the child, was rare. Most adults were moderately involved in children's play--50 families for boys and 55 families for girls. A low level of involvement occurred in 26 families for boys and 36 for girls. The degree of involvement of 41 families for boys and 24 for girls could not be determined.

The Fairchild family provided a good example of moderate adult involvement in children's play. The children often played alone in the garden or their rooms with their toys, books, or the pet hare. On the occasion that Emily hurt herself on the swing in the barn, the children were playing without adult involvement. But just as often, Mr. and Mrs.

Fairchild would take the children for walks, picnics, visits, and read or tell them stories. They showed an interest in their children's games even when they did not actually participate. Mrs. Fairchild, for example, was thoughtful enough to save some bits of ribbon and material for Emily to make clothes for her doll.

Mrs. Benson in Fabulous Histories was another mother who was moderately involved in her children's play. Although she was solicitous for their well-being and interested in their games and pastimes, she often left her children to play alone. She did join them for walks and visits to neighboring families. She also read to them or listened to them read, and told them stories.

In The Child's Birth-day by Isaac Taylor, the children often played alone but welcomed their mother whenever she joined them:

> As soon as the children saw her, "Oh! there is mamma coming to us," was the general exclamation; by which, the joy always excited by her presence, was expressed. She made herself so completely their friend, and so often almost their playmate, that her presence was no hindrance to their amusement; but most commonly felt as an increase, by the manner which she shaped, directed, or assisted their exertions.[130]

A moderate level of involvement in children's play indicated both solicitude and a general interest in children's games and pastimes. A low level of involvement indicated a certain neglect, a carelessness about the needs and morals and physical well-being of children. In The History of Isaac Jenkins, for example, the father was an indolent drunkard and the mother was a wretched, harried woman struggling to make ends meet. Neither parent showed any interest in their children's recreation. When Isaac mended his ways, however, there was an increasing involvement of both parents in their children's play. In "before and after" illustrations included in the book, the latter showed a comfortable domestic scene of Isaac, his wife, and children working and playing together beside a cheerful fire.

In The Family Mansion by Ann Taylor and Amendment by Catherine Parr Traill and Susanna Moodie, parental neglect was also shown. In the former, the parents were in the habit of leaving their children in the hands of servants. One child died as a result of this regrettable practice, the other child grew up vain and foolish, and eventually eloped with a disreputable man. In Amendment, the mother died leaving her children in the hands of her indolent debauched husband. He cared little for their play and eventually abandoned them altogether.

In The Little Woodman and His Dog Caesar by Mrs. Sherwood, low adult involvement in children's play was not due to neglect but to other circumstances. The little woodman's father was severely injured when a tree fell on him and confined him to his bed. His involvement in his son's play was therefore limited, although the two spent many hours together until the unfortunate man died.

A moderate degree of involvement in children's play, then, was the norm. A high or low degree of involvement indicated unusual circumstance, affliction, or neglect.

There appeared to be some relationship between social class and low adult involvement in children's play. Both the upper and lower classes were represented here in a greater proportion to their total numbers than the middle class. The reasons for this could have been due in part to the worldliness and frivolousness that was often associated with the upper class, and the poverty, affliction, wretchedness, and misery associated with the lower class. Two books just noted, Amendment and The History of Isaac Jenkins provide examples of this kind of association. The former was an upper class family, the latter a lower class family. Mr. Grant kept wild company, gambled, and drank to excess, and gave no thought to the state of his soul. Isaac Jenkins kept low company, spent every penny he earned on drink, and left his wife and children in misery and wretchedness. It was not until he reformed near the end of the book that he turned his thoughts to God.

Table 16 indicates the social class relationships as they pertained to adult involvement in children's play.

6. Degree of Adult Supervision of Children's Recreation

The figures for adult supervision of children's play are not unlike those for adult involvement in children's play, and in some cases, such as The Good Aunt by Harriet Ventum and The History of Little Henry and his Bearer by Mrs. Sherwood, adults who were highly involved in children's play were also highly involved in their supervision.

TABLE 16

DEGREE OF ADULT INVOLVEMENT IN CHILDREN'S PLAY

Degree of Adult Involvement in Boy's Play	Social Class of Family* Upper	Middle	Lower	Total
High	0	2	0	2
Moderate	13	35	2	50
Low	7	6	13	26
N/A N/G				41
Total				119

Degree of Adult Involvement in Girl's Play	Social Class of Family* Upper	Middle	Lower	Total
High	2	2	0	4
Moderate	12	41	2	55
Low	11	8	17	36
N/A N/G				24
Total				119

*The total number of families in each social class was: upper class 31, middle class 67, lower class 21.

Once again, only a few families highly supervised their children's play--4 and 6 families for boys and girls respectively. The majority of families, 50 and 56 families for boys and girls respectively, supervised their children's recreation to a moderate degree, and 25 and 33 families for boys and girls respectively supervised their children's play to a very low extent. The extent of adult supervision could not be determined in 40 families for boys and 24 families for girls.

In most cases of course, the same factors that contributed to a high degree of adult involvement in children's play contributed to a high degree of adult supervision. The adults represented in The Child's Birth-day were an exception. They were only moderately involved in their children's play, but supervised their children very closely nonetheless. The emphasis on supervison of children's play in this book was an extension of the parents' philosophy of education as the following passage illustrates. The passage begins with the arrival of mamma at the scene of one of her children's birthday games and festivities:

> All eyes were now attracted by a well known and beloved figure at a distance. Mamma had come into the garden, with maternal solicitude, to observe them, and take, if possible, an opportunity of throwing in some hint, which, as it did not come in the form of a direct lesson, would be more pleasantly received, and yet have an influence not less powerful than the most laboured exhortation. Her principle in education had always been, never to lose sight of her object; and experience had persuaded her that the formal lessons given by teachers, however needful and proper for communicating some sorts of knowledge, are yet but a small part of the teacher's duty. Children taught only at set times, and left to themselves at all intervals, will learn most of what they should not....Upon this principle, the good mother endeavoured to keep a constant watch over her little charge, and without seeming to spy, contrived to be present, and to

> observe the operation, either of those principles which she took so much pains to inculcate, or of other latent principles which she might discover, and by discerning, obtain the opportunity to counteract.[131]

Mamma's behavior, for all its expressed maternal solicitude, could be easily interpreted as intrusive. Here again it is possible to see the connection between education and recreation. Adults who supervised their children to a more moderate degree were no less solicitous for their children's welfare, but did allow their children to play more often by themselves. It is true that unsupervised play did sometimes lead to disaster, as in Emily's serious fall from the swing or Miss Augusta Noble's terrible death by fire as a result of playing with fire in The History of the Fairchild Family.

A low level of adult supervision of children's play often indicated neglect, as it did in the case of adult involvement in children's play, but this was not always the case. In Soffrona and her Cat Muff, for example, the two little girls, Soffrona and Sophia, were well loved by their mother as Mrs. Sherwood stated in her opening paragraph:

> Little Soffrona lived with a lady who loved her very much. She was not the lady's own child, but she was as dear to that lady as if she had been so, and the child always called her mamma. The lady had a little girl of her own called Sophia. Sophia was one year older than Soffrona; and Sophia and Soffrona...were very happy in each other's company.[132]

The children lived with their mother in a "very lovely house" and appeared to have all that they needed. They were good children too, even if Soffrona was thoughtless and lavished more care on a kitten than on a poor old woman. The lady never appeared to supervise their play, however, for they spent much of their time playing alone in the woods, running and skipping "like young fawns" and looking for "treasures"--"snail-shells, and painting-stones, and wild strawberries, and bilberries, and walnuts, and hazelnuts, and beautiful moss, and many kinds of flowers."[133]

The relationship between social class and the degree of adult supervision closely resembled that of adult involvement as the following table indicates:

TABLE 17

DEGREE OF ADULT SUPERVISION OF CHILDREN'S PLAY

Degree of Supervision of Boy's Play	Social Class of Family			
	Upper	Middle	Lower	Total
High	1	3	0	4
Moderate	13	35	2	50
Low	13	6	6	25
N/A N/G				40
Total				119

Degree of Supervision of Girl's Play	Social Class of Family			
	Upper	Middle	Lower	Total
High	1	5	0	6
Moderate	14	40	2	56
Low	9	7	17	33
N/A N/G				24
Total				119

7. Adult Recreational Activities

Because children were the focus of the stories in didactic literature, little attention was given to the recreational activities of adults. The majority of fictional adults were involved in some manner with children's recreational activities, and therefore, there was considerable overlapping between children's and adults' recreational activities. Overall, there was very little variety in the kind of activities adults enjoyed.

The greatest number of adults enjoyed reading, storytelling, walking, and visiting. A number of adults, both male and female, enjoyed music, as in The Memoirs of Emma and her Nurse and The Two Mothers, both by Mrs. Cameron. Parties and dances were enjoyed in such books as Emily, A Tale for Young Persons, Sophia by Mrs. Cameron, and The Daughter-in-law, her Father and Family by Barbara Hofland. Gardening was popular in The Way to be Happy and The History of the Fairchild Family. Very early in the latter book, the reader was told that Mr. Fairchild enjoyed gardening and allowed his little son to help him. After Henry had finished his lessons in the morning, Mr. Fairchild "took him very often to work in the garden; for Mr. Fairchild had great pleasure in helping John the servant to keep the garden clean."[134] Picnics and excursions were common. The Fairchild family enjoyed packing a lunch and setting out for the day to visit a worthy old woman named Mrs. Goodwill. On two other occasions the family packed a lunch and spent the day reading in a pleasant meadow.

In The History of Little Henry and his Bearer and Mary Campbell, excursions were also enjoyed, while in Montague Park by A. Selwyn, the family, adults and children, took an extended excursion or holiday tour of England and Scotland. There were no references to excursions to the seaside, but visiting the seaside did not in fact become popular until the second half of the century when cheap rail fares made the seaside more accessible to more people of all classes.[135] Adults attended the theatre in The Daughter-in-law, her Father and Family by Barbara Hofland and Ellen by Alicia Mant.

There was some differentiation in recreational activities for men and women. Riding and shooting were enjoyed by adult males in Ellen, Sophia by Mrs. Cameron, and Emily, A Tale for Young Persons, while drawing and needlework were enjoyed by women in Sophia and The Two Mothers by Mrs. Cameron.

Not all recreational activities presented were approved of by the authors. Isaac Jenkins, for example, drank to excess in The History of Isaac Jenkins by Thomas Beddoes. The fact that there was little else for him to do in the way of recreation in his wretched village was not considered by the author. Cards, whist, and billiards were played in The Willoughby Family and The Fruits of Education by Mrs. Cameron, James Manners, Little John and their Dog Bluff by Elizabeth Somerville, The Family Mansion by Ann Taylor, and Amendment by Catherine Parr Traill and Susanna Moodie. The families presented in these books and stories were ungodly, wordly, and frivolous, hardly a recommendation for these pastimes. Usually those who indulged in such recreation met some misfortune. Cruel and indolent James Manners, for example, gambled away most of his fortune playing cards. Mr. Grant in Amendment lost all his money too, and had to flee his creditors, leaving his motherless children destitute. In The Family Mansion the worldly, frivolous adults failed to properly supervise their children, with the result that one died and one eloped with a disreputable man. To make matters worse, the father of the family soon died, leaving enormous debts. Mr. and Mrs. Fairchild, Mrs. Sherwood wrote, "never played at cards." They asked for the coach and ended their visit to Sir Charles and Lady Noble's as soon as "tables were set out, and the ladies and gentlemen began to make parties for playing at cards."[136]

Because there was not enough detailed information about adult recreational activities, it was not possible to draw any conclusions about social class relationships and recreational activities. Some activities, of course, such as riding and shooting, were enjoyed by the upper classes only. Others, including drinking and gambling, reading, walking, and visiting were enjoyed by all classes.

8. Adult Reading Material

As with adult recreational activities, there was little detailed information about adult reading material. As would be expected, however, what information there was conformed to the pattern observed for children. Overall, fictional parents read the same sort of literature they desired their children to read. The majority of adults of both sexes read religious/didactic literature as did their children. It is interesting to note too, that as girls read more religious/didactic literature than boys--boys included classics to a far greater extent--so adult females read more religious/didactic literature than adult males. The latter also included classics in their choice of literature.

The first of the following tables (Table 18) indicates the popularity of each category of literature for male and female adults. The second table (Table 19) illustrates the relationship between preferred literature and social class. It will be observed in both cases that the figures in each category resemble those for children.

As the tables indicate, fantasy literature was not popular for adults any more than it was for children. Novels were included in this category for adults because at this period, the novel had not yet received respectable status. Novels were associated with cheap, romantic sensational literature which was thought to inflame the mind and the passions. Only frivolous, indolent, and ungodly persons read novels and similar fantasies in the didactic literature examined here. The Good Grandmother and her Offspring by Barbara Hofland contained a severe remonstrance against the practice. In the following passages, a husband criticized his wife for reading novels and the author described the results of her folly:

> /Novels are/ arrant nonsense, especially for people in our condition; who, having little time for reading,

TABLE 18

ADULT READING MATERIAL

Type of Literature	Number of Families Adult Males	 Adult Females
Religious only	0	1
Didactic only	0	0
Classics only	0	0
Fantasy only (including novels)	2	5
Religious/didactic	28	53
Religious/didactic/classics	26	12
Religious/didactic/classics/ fantasy	8	8
Religious/didactic/fantasy	0	0
Didactic/classics	0	0
Didactic/classics/fantasy	0	0
N/A N/G	55	40
Total	119	119

TABLE 19

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ADULT READING MATERIAL AND SOCIAL CLASS

Type of Literature	Social Class of Family-- Adult Males			
	Upper	Middle	Lower	Total
Religious only	0	0	0	0
Didactic only	0	0	0	0
Classics only	0	0	0	0
Fantasy only	1	1	0	2
Religious/didactic	4	17	7	28
Religious/didactic/classics	5	20	1	26
Religious/didactic/classics fantasy	6	2	0	8
Didactic/classics/fantasy	0	0	0	0
N/A N/G				55
Total				119

Type of Literature	Social Class of Family-- Adult Females			
	Upper	Middle	Lower	Total
Religious only	0	1	0	1
Didactic only	0	0	0	0
Classics only	0	0	0	0
Fantasy only	1	4	0	5
Religious/didactic	10	30	13	53
Religious/didactic/classics	4	8	0	12
Religious/didactic/classics fantasy	6	2	0	8
Didactic/classics/fantasy	0	0	0	0
N/A N/G				40
Total				119

> ought to be careful to employ it well, so as either to teach us our duty, assist us in our devotions, or increase our knowledge...[137]

> Seeking only for her own selfish gratification, she neglected alike her house, her infant and her invaluable husband, to pursue the pernicious practice of devouring, rather than reading, whatever came her way in the shape of a romance, and with peculiar avidity choosing all those whose horrible combinations and unnatural events were most likely to stimulate her spirits and initiate the morbid sensibility of her enervated mind.[138]

The unfortunate husband had to care for the children because his foolish wife habitually slept late

> having wept till past midnight over some imaginary heroine's sorrows, had crept to bed lanquid and nervous, to dream of horrors the rest of the night, and then doze till noon to recover her faculties.[139]

The author added the following note:

> This picture of life-consuming folly is by no means overcharged; the author has witnessed such conduct carried to still more disgusting lengths even in this situation of life![140]

The author reflected current opinion on the harmful effects of such literature. As Richard D. Altick states in The English Common Reader. A Social History of the Mass Reading Public 1800 - 1900:

> The evil results of devotion to "light literature" were well established in national legend; reading extracts from the correspondence on the subject in the London Evening Standard in January, 1891, one feels the date line could just as well be "1791" or "1831." Whenever he entered a public library, one man wrote, "I have found, as a rule, every chair occupied--and by whom? In nine cases out of ten by loafing office boys or clerks, who were using their masters' time for devouring all the most trivial literary trash they could get ....Many are the crimes brought about by the disordered imagination of a reader of sensational, and often immoral, rubbish, whilst many a home is neglected and uncared for owing to the all-absorbed novel reading wife."[141]

Although in the didactic literature examined, no lower class families indulged in this questionable practice, there was some fear that they might. The only approved reading material for the lower classes was religious or religious/didactic literature. As a father explained in A Week at Christmas (1829):

> Our duties must accord with our station in life. The labouring people have very little leisure for reading; neither can they afford to buy books. The little they do read is apt to puff them up with imaginary knowledge. They soon grow wise in their own conceit, and quite unlike the humble Psalmist, who said, I do not exercise myself in great matters, which are too high for me (Psalm cxxxi.2). It is well that all Christians should be taught to read; but whose duty it is to earn their bread by the sweat of their brow, should use the little time they have, in reading that which is most important for them to know. They have precious souls to be saved, as well as kings, and princes, and governors. In the Holy Bible they will learn how to employ their time to the best advantage; they will learn the true use of life. They who possess a Bible may be quite indifferent about all other books.[142]

Recreation, no less than education, was to be in accord with one's station in life.

IV. Conclusion

It must be clear that a definite and very important relationship exists between the development of a concept of childhood, the development of educational philosophies for children, and the development of children's games and pastimes. All three developments depend on a recognition that childhood is a unique and important period of life and that children's needs and abilities differ from those of adults.

The authors of the pre-Victorian didactic children's literature examined here had no doubts about the importance of childhood, and no lack of philosophies of childhood and recreation. The educational orientation presented in the literature was described as Evangelical, and it influenced the type of schooling the children received, all aspects of the curriculum, and even recreational activities. As emphasized throughout the chapter, the didactic authors saw a close connection between education and recreation. The lessons of the school room should not be forgotten in play. There was, therefore great emphasis on useful play, instructive play, improving play. As the good mother in Isaac Taylor's book, The Child's Birth-day, knew:

> The formal lessons given by teachers, however needful and proper for communicating some sorts of knowledge, are yet but a small part of the teacher's duty. Children taught only at set times, and left to themselves at all intervals, will soon learn most of what they should not.[143]

Recreation was thus an extension of education. Recreation that was "mere amusement," that was simple idleness, that was not productive or improving, was discouraged. While it would seem that the didactic authors could accept and recognize play or recreation as necessary for the refreshment of the mind and body, recreation was still too closely associated with idleness, temptation, frivolousness, worldliness, and the flesh. Play needed to be controlled and supervised and made virtuous and morally beneficial. Although few adults constantly supervised or played with their children, the majority of adults took at least a moderate interest in their children's recreational activities. Hours of recreation were strictly limited as well. Few children played freely hour after hour. Recreation was permitted after lessons were completed, and was limited in length by other duties such as teaching, caring for younger children, sewing or making things for the poor, and visiting. And as emphasized above, this recreation time itself was to be used profitably whenever possible. Reading, writing letters, sewing, gardening, and caring for animals were common recreational activities. Certain kinds of reading material, the profane, worldly, or frivolous were discouraged in favor of the more serious and improving religious/didactic literature, and certain forms of recreation such as card playing, gambling, drinking, and even dancing in some cases, were frowned upon.

Although the didactic authors undoubtedly reflected the concerns and fears of an important segment of pre-Victorian society, it cannot be stated so confidently that they reflected the attitudes of all pre-Victorians. Blake, Wordsworth, and Coleridge had written at length about the innocence of childhood, and beauty and purity of children's play, and Charles Lamb, who lived almost to the end of the period, complained in 1802 in a letter to Coleridge that

> Goody Two-Shoes is almost out of print. Miss Barbauld's stuff has banished all the old classics of the nursery; and the shopmen at Newbery's hardly deigned to reach them off an old exploded shelf, when Mary asked for them. Mrs. B.'s and Mrs. Trimmer's nonsense lay in piles about....Damn them!--I mean the cursed Barbauld crew, those Blights and Blasts of all that is Human in man and child.[144]

Lamb was not alone in his lament, and by the end of the pre-Victorian period the fairy tale and other forms of fantasy literature were increasing in popularity. By the middle of the century, Perrault, Grimm and Anderson were all available in English.

Lamb's criticism, while it does indicate that not all pre-Victorians enjoyed this didactic literature and probably did not share this world view, also shows that didactic literature was the most prevalent type of literature for children at this time. Its prevalence in turn indicates that it reflected the views of a very large number of pre-Victorians.

Whatever didactic children's literature may reveal about the views of a large and influential part of nineteenth century society, it reveals very little about the great social and economic changes that were taking place in society and that were affecting traditional patterns in education and recreation. The controversy over education for the poor, for example, was barely hinted at in A Week at Christmas. Learning to read the Bible was sufficient for those "whose duty it is to earn their bread by the sweat of their brow." "Our duties must accord with our station in life," this father said. Books other than the Bible are "apt to puff them up with imaginary knowledge" and "they soon grow wise in their own conceit."[145] Educational developments in general were not discussed, even though this was a very important period in the history of education in England.[146] Similarly, the great changes in traditional patterns of recreation so lamented by Ariès and recent historians of leisure and recreation received no mention. There is no evidence in the literature of "the decline of popular recreation" or "the gradual breakdown of what we now call traditional society" in the face of industrialization.[147] Games and pastimes were simply described in the books and stories and were used to facilitate moral and religious instruction or to add interest and credibility. The didactic authors examined had little interest in recreation itself beyond its possible improving and instructive properties. The only real change in traditional recreational patterns reflected in the literature was the movement away from animal blood sports. But this increased emphasis on kindness to animals had more to do with the Evangelical movement than industrialization.

The social class issues, so much a subject of heated controversy, so important in matters of education and recreation in this period of history, were greatly simplified in didactic children's literature. As stated elsewhere, these authors reflected a very static society, a very ideal society in which all classes knew their places and their duties. Upper and middle class children had a better education than lower class children because their parents were wealthier and because their station in life required it. Lower class children needed only to know how to read the Bible. To give them more education would hardly be fair, for it would raise their expectations unrealistically and lead to dissatisfaction and unhappiness. Upper class children also had more playthings, baby-houses, rocking horses, tops, and skates. Lower class children made do with lesser things. The upper and middle classes were expected to help remedy such deficiencies in the natural order through charity, gifts, and provision of funds for schools for the poor. Social class relationships in didactic children's literature were that simple and straightforward.

Didactic children's literature, then, hardly provides an accurate picture of education and recreation in the early nineteenth century. What it does do, however, is provide a vivid illustration of the views and opinions of an important and influential part of pre-Victorian society. It is an idealized and restricted picture of early nineteenth century society that is presented here, but details of children's schooling, toys, games, and pastimes make the picture realistic and convincing. In this way it attains a certain truth and historical validity.

NOTES

[1] Philippe Ariès, Centuries of Childhood. A Social History of Family Life (New York: Vintage Books, 1965), p. 50.

[2] Ibid., p. 145.

[3] By "little schools" and "the lower classes of the colleges," Ariès means primary and secondary education respectively. There is some vagueness or confusion in these terms as his explanation indicates:

> Until the seventeenth century, there was no term for elementary education in everday French. The term petite école, corresponding to 'little school' or 'petty school' in English, did not appear until the seventeenth century. The cantor Joly, writing his defence of schoolmasters in 1678, maintained that the expression was recent, going back to the sixteenth century at the earliest, and also incorrect, 'contrary to the old form.' According to Joly, the correct form was 'grammar school.' But we know that the grammar school also tended to be confused with the college, and Joly took advantage of the vagueness of this terminology to contrast what would become the 'little schools' (i.e. primary education) with the university and the lower classes in college (i.e. secondary education) p. 286.

[4] Ibid., p. 314.

[5] S. J. Curtis, History of Education in Britain, sixth edition, (London: University Tutorial Press, 1965), p. 276. The elementary education act of 1870 gave school boards the power to make by-laws for the compulsory attendance of children between the ages of five and thirteen and for setting the school-leaving age.

[6] These figures, however, could be determined in only nineteen and eighteen families for boys and girls respectively.

[7] James Janeway, A Token for Children: Being an Exact Account of the Conversion, Holy and Exemplary Lives, and Joyful Deaths of several young Children (London: T. Norris, 1711) The Contents, Part I. This book, although originally published in 1672 was still very popular in the early nineteenth century. In 1828 Mrs. Cameron provided a new edition, slightly altered "to render the work correct and intelligible to modern ears." Mrs. Cameron added to the original thirteen examples or deaths, making a total of thirty-six memoirs.

[8] Samuel Butler, The Way of All Flesh (Penquin Books, 1977), p. 117. The reason for this precocity was his parents' careful attention to his education:

> Before Ernest could well crawl he was taught to kneel; before he could well speak he was taught to lisp the Lord's prayer, and the general confession. How was it possible that these things could be taught too early? If his attention flagged or his memory failed him, here was an ill weed which would grow apace, unless it were plucked out immediately, and the only way to pluck it out was to whip him or shut him up in a cupboard, or dock him some of the small pleasures of childhood. Before he was three years old he could read, and after a fashion, write. Before he was four he was learning Latin, and could do the rule of three sums.

[9] John Stuart Mill, Autobiography and Other Writings, edited by Jack Stillinger (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, Riverside Edition, 1969), p. 5.

[10] Mary Martha Sherwood, The History of the Fairchild Family; or the children's manual; being a collection of stories calculated to show the importance and effects of religious education (London: J. Hatchard and Son, 1818), p. 1.

[11] Ibid., p. 266.

[12] Ibid.

[13] J. F. C. Harrison, Early Victorian Britain 1832 - 51 (Fontana Books, 1979), pp. 165 - 166. Although the educational scene was far more complex than Harrison's statement would indicate, his summary is useful. For a fuller discussion of the subject see W. H. G. Armitage, Four Hundred Years of English Education (Cambridge University Press, 1970), S. J. Curtis, History of Eduction in Britain, sixth edition (London: University Tutorial Press, 1965), John Lawson and Harold Silver, A Social History of Education in England (London: Methuen and Company, 1973), and Brian Simon, Studies in the History of Education 1780 - 1870 (London: Lawrence and Wishart, 1960).

[14] It will be recalled from Chapter II that 39 out of 119 families employed at least a nurse, a tutor, or a governess. Those children who received some instruction from a governess or a tutor would have been at least upper-middle class.

[15] Sherwood, Fairchild Family, p. 265.

[16] Edward White Benson, Education at Home; or a father's instructions (London: Printed for Baldwin, Cradock and Joy, 1824), p. v.

[17] It can be argued of course that neither father nor son were ordinary men. In his Autobiography the younger Mill concluded his account of his educational experience under his father's tutelage as follows:

> The education which my father gave me, was in itself much more fitted for training me to *know* than to *do*. Not that he was unaware of my deficiencies, both as a boy and as a youth I was incessantly smarting under his severe admonitions on the subject. There was anything but insensibility or tolerance on his part towards such shortcomings: but while he saved me from the demoralizing effects of school life, he made no effort to provide me with any sufficient substitute for its practicalizing influences. Whatever qualities he himself, probably, had acquired without difficulty or special training, he seems to have supposed that I ought to acquire as easily. He had not, I think, bestowed the same amount of thought and attention on this, as on most other branches of education; and here, as well as in some other points of my tuition, he seems to have expected effects without causes.

The editor of the Riverside edition (Houghton Mifflin) of *Autobiography*, Jack Stillinger, notes that "in cancelled passages of the original MS Mill speaks more specifically of the 'very considerable drawbacks' that attended his education, drawbacks 'which have pursued me through life'" (pp. 22 - 23).

[18] Mary Martha Sherwood, *The Little Woodman and His Dog Caesar*, twelfth edition, (Wellington, Salop.: Printed by and for F. Houlston and Son, 1828), p. 87.

[19] [Maria Budden] *Always Happy!!! or, anecdotes of Felix and his sister Serena. A Tale. Written for her children, by a mother* (London: J. Harris, 1814), p. 57.

[20] Richard D. Altick, *Victorian People and Ideas* (New York: W. W. Norton, 1973), pp. 55. George Eliot was one of a number of Victorian novelists who said much the same thing. In *The Mill on the Floss* (1860) she poignantly demonstrated the injustice of the situation in the case of little Maggie Tulliver and her brother Tom:

> [Maggie] told Tom she should like to go to school to Mr. Stelling, as he did, and learn the same things. She knew she could do Euclid, for she had looked into it again, and she saw what A B C meant: they were the names of the lines.
> "I'm sure you couldn't do it, now," said Tom; "and I'll just ask Mr. Stelling if you could."
> "I don't mind," said the little conceited minx. "I'll just ask him myself."
> "Mr. Stelling," she said, that same evening when they were in the drawing-room, "couldn't I do Euclid, and all Tom's lessons, if you were to teach me instead of him?"
> "No; you couldn't," said Tom, indignantly. "Girls can't do Euclid: can they sir?"
> "They can pick up a little of everything, I daresay," said Mr. Stelling. "They've a great deal of superficial

> cleverness; but they couldn't go far into anything. They're quick and shallow."
>
> Tom, delighted with this verdict, telegraphed his triumph by wagging his head at Maggie behind Mr. Stelling's chair. As for Maggie, she had hardly ever been so mortified. She had been so proud to be called "quick" all her little life and now it appeared that this quickness was the brand of inferiority. It would have been better to be slow, like Tom.
>
> "Ha, ha! Miss Maggie!" said Tom, when they were alone; "you see it's not such a fine thing to be quick. You'll never go far into anything, you know."
>
> And Maggie was so oppressed by this dreadful destiny that she had no spirit for a retort.

George Eliot, The Mill on the Floss (Boston: Houghton-Mifflin, 1961), pp. 134 - 134.

In Middlemarch, published eleven years later (1871-72), Eliot's criticism was no less bitter. The female character in this situation was no little girl but a young woman, Dorothea Brooke. The following exchange took place between Dorothea's uncle and her fiance, Mr. Casaubon:

> "Well, but now, Casaubon, such deep studies, classics, mathematics, that kind of thing, are too taxing for a woman, too taxing, you know."
>
> "Dorothea is learning to read the /Greek/ characters simply," said Mr. Casaubon, evading the question. "She has had the very considerate thought of saving my eyes."
>
> "Ah, well, without understanding, you know--that may not be so bad. But there is a lightness about the feminine mind--a touch and go--music, the fine arts, that kind of thing--they should study up to a certain point, women should; but in a light way, you know. A woman should be able to sit down and play you or sing you a good old English tune. That is what I like; though I have heard most things--been at the opera in Vienna: Gluck, Mozart, everything of that sort. But I'm a conservative in music--its not like ideas, you know. I stick to the good old tunes."
>
> "Mr. Casaubon is not fond of the piano, and I am very glad he is not," said Dorothea, whose slight regard for domestic music and feminine art must be forgiven her, considering the small tinkling and smearing in which they chiefly consisted at that dark period.

George Eliot, Middlemarch (Boston: Houghton-Mifflin, 1968) p. 48.

[21] Budden, Always Happy!!!, p. 189.

[22] Ibid., pp. 190 - 191.

[23] Eliot, Middlemarch, p. 48.

[24] Sherwood, Fairchild Family, pp. 1 - 2.

[25] G. M. Young, Portrait of an Age. Victorian England, second edition (London: Oxford University Press, 1977), p. 4.

[26] A sense of this precious trust can be found in the poetry of Blake and Wordsworth and other so-called Romantic poets. Note the following passage from Wordsworth's Ode: Intimations of Immortality from Recollections of Early Childhood:

> Our birth is but a sleep and a forgetting:
> The Soul that rises with us, our life's Star,
> Hath had elsewhere its setting,
> And cometh from afar:
> Not in entire forgetfulness,
> And not in utter nakedness,
> But trailing clouds of glory do we come
> From God, who is our home:
> Heaven lies about us in our infancy!
> --stanza v

Note also here the emphasis on childhood innocence.

[27] Reprinted in Philip J. Greven, ed., Child-Rearing Concepts 1628 - 1861: Historical Sources (Itasca, Ill.: F. E. Peacock, 1973), p. 101.

[28] Lucy Lyttelton Cameron, The Fruits of Education; or the two guardians (Wellington, Salop.: Printed for Houlston and Son, 1827), pp. 148 - 149.

[29] Ibid., pp. 16 - 17.

[30] Ibid., pp. 31 - 32.

[31] Ibid., p. 37.

[32] Elizabeth Somerville, James Manners, Little John, and their Dog Bluff (London: Darton, Harvey and Darton, 1818) p. 136.

[33] John Lawson and Harold Silver, A Social History of Education in England (London: Methuen, 1973), p. 226.

[34] Ibid., p. 231.

[35] Elizabeth Somerville, Preludes to Knowledge; or, amusing and instructive conversations on history, astronomy, geography, optics, and the division of time and etc., and etc. Also moral and entertaining stories (London: Edward Lacy /ca. 1830/), pp. iii - iv.

[36] Eliot, Middlemarch, p. 48.

[37] Isaac Taylor, The Child's Birth-day (London: Darton, Harvey, and Darton, 1811, 1815) pp. 130 - 131.

[38] Ibid., pp. 110 - 111.

[39] Budden, Always Happy!!!, p. 8.

[40] Ibid., p. 10.

[41] Charlotte Brontë, Jane Eyre (New York: Scholastic Book Services, 1967), p. 91. Charlotte Brontë knew the importance of a knowledge of French both for her heroine and for herself. Hating the life of a governess, she proposed to open a school of her own with her sisters. She understood, however, that her own proficiency in the language was not sufficient, and she wrote to her aunt requesting support for a plan to study French at a school on the continent:

> My friends recommend me, if I desire to secure permanent success, to delay commencing the school for six months or longer, and by all means contrive, by hook or by crook, to spend the intervening time in some school on the Continent. They say schools in England are so numerous, competition so great, that without some step towards attaining superiority, we shall probably have a very hard struggle, and may fail in the end. They say, moreover, that the loan of £ 100, which you have been so kind to offer us, will perhaps, not be all required now, as Miss Wooler will lend us the furniture; and that, if the speculation is intended to be a good and successful one, half the sum, at least, ought to be laid out in the manner I have mentioned, thereby insuring a more speedy repayment both of interest and principal.
>
> I would not go to France or to Paris. I would go to Brussels, in Belgium. The cost of the journey there, at the dearest rate of travelling, would be £ 5; living there little more than half as dear as it is in England, and the facilities for education are equal or superior to any other place in Europe. In half a year I could acquire a thorough familiarity with French. I could improve greatly in Italian, and even get a dash of German....

(Quoted in Margaret Lane, The Brontë Story. A Reconsideration of Mrs. Gaskell's Life of Charlotte Brontë, Fontana Books, 1979, pp. 157 - 158).)

Charlotte hoped that with the assistance of a wealthier friend who was already staying at an expensive school

> she would make me acquainted with the city; and, with the assistance of her cousins, I should probably be introduced to connections far more improving, polished, and cultivated, than any I have yet known. These are advantages which would turn to real account, when we actually commenced a school; and, if Emily could share them with me, we could take a footing in the world which we can never do now.... (p. 158)

[42] Elizabeth Somerville, Flora; or, the deserted child (London: Printed for J. Harris, 1811), p. 16.

[43] Lucy Lyttelton Cameron, The Two Mothers; or, memoirs of the last century (Wellington, Salop.: Printed for and by F. Houlston and Son, 1824), pp. 156 - 157.

[44] Miss Grierson, The Visit; or, mamma and the children (Edinburgh: William Oliphant, 1824), p. 29.

[45] Hannah More, The Shepherd of Salisbury Plain (London: sold by J. E. Evans..../ca. 1830/), p. 23. The book was first published in 1795. If anyone knew about schooling for the poor, it was Hannah More, a prolific author of Evangelical tracts and an important figure in the Sunday school movement. The purpose of the Sunday schools was simple, as Lawson and Silver write in A Social History of Education in England (op. cit.): "to teach children to read the Bible, and, in Hannah More's words, 'train up the lower classes in habits of industry and piety'" (p. 239). Schools like the one described in The Shepherd of Salisbury Plain were gradually superceded by monitorial schools which could teach more children more efficiently and cheaply. About charity schools in general Lawson and Silver wrote:

> Charity schools were themselves able to make only a limited contribution to education /In the changing society of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries7. Some counties, such as Lincolnshire and Derbyshire, had a fair scatter of charity schools (in 1800 Derbyshire had seventy-four charity schools well distributed over the county). New ones were still being founded, as, for example, a day school of industry founded at St. Marylebone, in London, in 1791, where the boys were employed in shoe-closing, shoe-making, and pin-heading, and the girls in wool-spinning and reeling, knitting, and needlework. Subscribers were invited to give orders for their shirts, shifts, and table linen. The 200 children in the school were trained 'to the habits of virtue and industry'.... In 1791 the children of Lincoln were 'taught to read, say the Church Catechism, and short Morning and Evening Prayers....They are instructed in such plain religious truths as they can understand; such as will direct and fix their faith, improve their hearts, and regulate their manners.' Hannah More considered writing an unnecessary accomplishment for the poor, and this view was widely held. The Wesleyans particularly opposed the teaching of writing in their Sunday schools. (pp. 239 - 240.)

One cannot really expect more than this for poor children in a society that believed strongly in knowing one's station in life, and Hannah More, who wanted "to teach the poor to read the Bible and to train up the lower classes in habits of industry and piety,' was more enlightened than many of her contemporaries. She was actually charged with 'sedition, disaffection, and a general aim to corrupt the principles of the community.' These were her own words, according to R. D. Altick in The English Common Reader. A Social History of the Mass Reading Public 1800 - 1900 (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1957), p. 73. For an account of her activities and her involvement with the Cheap Repository Tracts see pp. 73 - 77.

[46] Somerville, Preludes to Knowledge, pp. 85 - 86.

[47] Diana Bayley, Improvement; or, a visit to grandmamma (London: M. Arnold, 1832), pp. 107 - 110.

[48] Emulation; or, the way to be great and happy (London: Printed for Harvey and Darton, 1827), pp. iii- iv.

[49] Ibid., p. 2.

[50] Ibid., p. 67.

[51] A. Selwyn, Montague Park; or, family incidents (London: William Cole, 1825), pp. 261 - 262.

[52] Somerville, Preludes to Knowledge, pp. 85 - 86.

[53] Sherwood, The Fairchild Family, p. 2.

[54] Sarah Trimmer, Fabulous Histories, designed for the instruction of children, respecting their treatment of animals (Dublin: Printed for Messers W. Watson, Collis, Wilson, Wogan, White, Byrne...., 1786), pp. 157 - 158. There were many editions of this book throughout the late eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.

The author of the preface to the Garland edition of Fabulous Histories, relates Mrs. Benson's concern--rarely found in England before Mrs. Trimmer's time--to "the result of the Royal Society's experiments on anatomy and blood transfusions in animals, demonstrating that animals were not such a different order of being from people after all." (pp. ix - x.)

[55] Sherwood, The Fairchild Family, pp. 15 - 17.

[56] From Instruction to Delight. An Anthology of Children's Literature to 1850, edited by Patricia Demers and Gordon Moyles (Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1982), p. 186.

[57] Lucy Newton; or, an experiment in education (London and Wellington, Salop.: Printed for Houlston and Son, 1830), pp. 15 - 17.

[58] Ibid., p. 58.

[59] Ibid., pp. 71 - 72.

[60] Mary Martha Sherwood, *Susannah; or, the three guardians* (London: Longman, Rees, Orme, Brown, and Green, and etc., 1827), p. 16.

[61] Edward White Benson, *Education at Home; or, a father's instructions* (London: Printed for Baldwin, Cradock and Joy, 1824), pp. 86 - 87.

[62] Ibid., pp. 89 - 90, 93.

[63] Thomas Beddoes, *The History of Isaac Jenkins....* (Dublin: Printed by R. D. Webb, 1831), pp. 47 - 48.

[64] Sherwood, *The Fairchild Family*, p. 55.

[65] Ibid., p. 57.

[66] Harriet Ventum, *The Good Aunt....*(London: C. Chapple, 1813), pp. 78 - 79.

[67] Hannah More, *The Good Mother's Legacy* (London: Sold by J. E. Evans..../ca. 1830/), p. 3.

[68] Lucy Lyttelton Cameron, *Memoirs of Emma and her Nurse; or, the history of Lady Harewood* (London: Houlston and Son, 1825), p. 76.

[69] Ibid., p. 130.

[70] -------, *The History of Margaret Whyte; or, the life and death of a good child* (Wellington, Salop.: Printed by and for F. Houlston and Son, 1827), pp. 69 - 70.

[71] Sherwood, *The Fairchild Family*, p. 109.

[72] Ibid., p. 112.

[73] Ibid., p. 111.

[74] Ibid., pp. 111 - 112.

[75] Lucy Lyttelton Cameron, *The Sister's Friend; or, Christmas Holidays spent at home* (London: L. G. Seeley and Sons, 1831), p. 60.

[76] Benson, *Education at Home*, pp. 112 - 113.

[77] Ibid., p. 110.

[78] Mamma's Stories, read by herself to her little girl (London: Darton, Harvey and Darton, 1814), p. 29.

[79] Sherwood, The Fairchild Family, pp. 92 - 93.

[80] Isaac Taylor, The Child's Birth-day (London: Darton, Harvey and Darton, 1811, 1815), pp. 69 - 70.

[81] Ibid., pp. 70 - 71.

[82] Ibid.

[83] Trimmer, Fabulous Histories, Advertisement.

[84] It was a harsh age for both the animal and human creation as it is well known. Cruelty to animals was first made a punishable offence in England in 1822. Sixty-seven years later similar legislation was passed aimed at protecting children. Interestingly, animals were recognized as victims sooner than children. Children were not totally without protection in these intervening years, however, for the RSPCA, established in 1824, prosecuted cases of child abuse as well as animal abuse. As Ruth Perry has pointed out in the introduction of the Garland edition of Fabulous Histories, "concern for children and concern for animals go together" p. xii. It is difficult not to see a close relationship between cruelty to animals and cruelty to children.

It is interesting that in North America too, humane societies were concerned with preventing cruelty to women and children as well as animals. J. J. Kelso, a leading figure in the child welfare movement in Canada, began his career as one of the founders and first president of the Toronto Humane Society in 1887. As his most recent biographers write:

> He proposed a general human association with a broad set of objectives: preventing cruelty to children, rescuing children from vicious influences and remedying their condition; preventing the beating of animals; overloading streetcars, overloading wagons, working old horses, or driving galled or disabled animals; introducing drinking fountains, passing more effective laws prohibiting cruelty; adopting better horseshoeing methods; disseminating humane literature into homes and schools; teaching children to be humane; and encouraging everyone to practise and teach kindness to animals and others.

Andrew Jones and Leonard Rutman, In the Children's Aid. J. J. Kelso and Child Welfare in Ontario (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1981), p. 21.

[85] Throwing at cocks is a less familiar amusement than cock fighting and may need some explanation. Robert W. Malcolmson describes it in his book, Popular Recreations in English Society 1700 - 1850:

> The method of the amusement, which was a precursor of many modern fairground entertainments, was stark and uncomplicated: a cock was tied to a stake by a cord, and the competitors, standing some twenty yards away, tried to knock it down by throwing some kind of missile, normally a cudgel or a broom-stick. In most instances the sport was run as a private enterprise, with the owner of the cock charging about twopence for three throws. If a thrower could knock the cock down and run and secure the bird before it regained its feet, the cock was his; sometimes he would then set himself up as the promoter....Writing in the early 1780's, James Spershott of Chichester described how, during the second quarter of the century,
>
>> on Shrove Tuesday the most unmanly and cruel exercise of 'cock scailing' was in vogue everywhere, even in the High Church 'lighten' and many other places in the city and in the country. Scarcely a churchyard was to be found but a number of those poor innocent birds were thus barbarously treated. Tying them by the leg with a string about 4 or 5 feet long fastened to the ground, and, when he is made to stand fair, a great ignorant merciless fellow, at a distance agreed upon and at two pence three throws, flings a 'scail' at him till he is quite dead. And thus their legs are broken and their bodies bruised in a shocking manner....

Robert W. Malcolmson, Popular Recreations in English Society 1700 - 1850 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1973), p. 48.

[86] Mary Martha Sherwood, Soffrona and her Cat Muff (Wellington, Salop.: Printed by and for Houlston and Son, 1828), pp. 10 - 11.

[87] Ibid., pp. 15 - 17.

[88] Taylor, The Child's Birth-day, pp. 72 - 73.

[89] William Francis Sullivan, trans., Emily and Henrietta; or, a cure for idleness. An improving tale for youth (London: Dean and Munday, 1818), pp. 46 - 48.

[90] Taylor, The Child's Birth-day, pp. 65 - 67.

[91] Ibid., pp. 31 - 33.

[92] It must be noted that the image of the father here is consistent with that established in Chapter III. This father is firm, authoritarian, but capable of gentleness. He inspires both love and respect--as an ideal father should.

[93] A. Selwyn, Montague Park, p. 10.

[94] In didactic children's literature, the anxiety was presented in a positive light as extreme solicitude for the moral and spiritual welfare of tender and impressionable children. In some adult literature, particularly Father and Son, this anxiety was presented as harmful and even paranoiac. Gosse's description of his early days in London and his father's "postal inquisition" is very telling. See the Epilogue in the Penquin edition pp. 208 - 224. Parts of this section are also quoted in this thesis in the notes to Chapter III.

[95] Budden, Always Happy!!!, p. 60.

[96] Thomas Hughes, Tom Brown's School-days (London: MacMillan, 1974), p. 72. The book was first published in 1857.

[97] John Locke, Some Thoughts Concerning Education (New York: Teachers College Press, Columbia University, 1971), no. 70. p. 49.

> Locke considers the problem as follows:
> I confess, both sides have their inconveniences. Being abroad, it is true, will make him bolder, and better able to bustle and shift amongst boys of his own age; and the emulation of schoolfellows often puts life and industry into young lads. But till you can find a school, wherein it is possible for the master to look after the manners of his scholars, and can show as great effects of his care of forming their minds to virtue, and their carriage to good breeding, as of forming their tongues to the learned languages; you must confess, that you have a strange value for words, when preferring the languages of the ancient Greeks and Romans to that which made them such brave men, you think it worth while to hazard your son's innocence and virtue for a little Greek and Latin. For, as for that boldness and spirit which lads get amongst their playfellows at school, it has ordinarily such a mixture of rudeness and an ill-turned confidence, that those misbecoming and disingenuous ways of shifting in the world must be unlearned, and all the tincture washed out again to make way for better principles, and such manners as make a truly worthy man. He that considers how diametrically opposite the skill of living well, and managing, as a man should do, his affairs in the world, is to that malapertness, tricking, or violence, learned among schoolboys, will think the faults of a privater education infinitely to be preferred to such improvements; and will take care to preserve his child's innocence and modesty at home, as being nearer of kin, and more in the way of those qualities, which make a useful and able man. (pp. 48-49).

[98] Cameron, The Sister's Friend, pp. 8 - 9.

[99] Lucy Lyttelton Cameron, Sophia, or, the source and benefit of affliction (Wellington, Salop: Printed for and by F. Houlston and Son, 1829), p. 127.

[100] Ibid., pp. 128 - 130.

[101] See Curtis, op. cit., or Lawson and Silver, op. cit., for general accounts of conditions in the public schools or The Public School Phenomenon 597 - 1977 (Penguin Books, 1979) by Jonathan Gathorne-Hardy for a more particular, rather sensational account.

[102] Curtis, op. cit., p. 129. The great rebellion at Rugby in 1797 was so serious that the military were called out and the Riot Act read. Curtis cautions that "it would not be true to say that all these revolts were caused by bad conditions. Even the most enlightened schoolmasters had to face them." (p. 129)

[103] Mary Hughes, A Mother's Care Rewarded; in the correction of those defects, most general in young people, during their education (London: William Darton, 1824), pp. 80 - 83.

[104] The History of Good Two-Shoes, taken from From Instruction to Delight, op. cit., p. 117.

[105] The Factory Girl (London and Wellington, Salop: Printed for Houlston and Son, 1831), pp. 50 - 51.

[106] Lawson and Silver, op. cit., p. 239.

[107] Sherwood, Soffrona and her Cat Muff, pp. 5 - 6.

[108] S. W., The Warren Family, or, scenes at home (London: James and Bain, 1813, 1814), pp. 63 - 65.

[109] Benson, Education at Home, p. 112.

[110] Sherwood, The Fairchild Family, pp. 164 - 165.

[111] Pictures and descriptions of both the horn book and the battledore can be found in From Instruction to Delight pp. 15 - 23. According to the editors, the battledore was modelled on the washerwoman's board or paddle ("batyldoure") and was popular well into the nineteenth century. It developed an increasingly sophisticated format.

[112] Mary Elliot, The Truant Reclaimed (London: William Darton, 1825), pp. 18 - 22.

[113] Sherwood, Soffrona and her Cat Muff, pp. 6 - 8.

[114] Sherwood, The Fairchild Family, p. 76.

[115] Ibid., p. 77

[116] Ibid., p. 95.

[117] Ibid., pp. 46 - 47.

[118] Ibid., p. 51.

[119] Budden, Always Happy!!!, p. 47.

[120] More, The Good Mother's Legacy, p. 3.

[121] Dorothy Kilner, The Holiday Present; containing anecdotes of Mr. and Mrs. Jennet and their little family...interspersed with instructive and amusing stories and observations (London: Printed for John Harris; Baldwin and Cradock, 1831), p. 80. The book was first published about 1780 and was republished many times. This quotation was actually taken from the 1788 edition printed and sold by John Marshall, but it differs very little from the later edition. In the later edition the type was modernized and Thomas rather than Tom was used. The odd word was changed or left out as well, but this may be an omission rather than a deliberate change.

[122] Ibid., p. 72.

[123] One would like to suggest that reading was a more important leisure activity in the nineteenth century than it is today because books did not have to compete with such things as television, motion pictures, and video games. However, before one becomes too optimistic about reading in the past, one should examine the literacy figures for the period. Richard D. Altick writes that

> the Victorian literacy figures that come down to us are, for one reason or another, very unsatisfactory evidence of how many people were able to read. The first nation-wide report, made in 1840 and based on ability to sign the marriage register, was that 67 per cent of the males and 51 per cent of the females were literate....The census of 1851 placed the rate for the whole nation at 69.3 per cent for males and 54.8 per cent for females. But even if these figures happen to be a reasonably accurate reflection of the number able to read, they tell us nothing of the quality of literacy. There was a large fringe area of the population which, though technically literate, could barely spell out the simplest kind of writing.

(The English Common Reader, p. 170).

[124] Eliot, Middlemarch, p. 48. Classics had long held pride of place in the curriculum of an upper and middle class

English boy. As Jonathan Gathorne-Hardy writes in The Public School Phenomenon, it was part of a general veneration of the classical past and more:

> The classical past was not just revered. The 18th century had, in contemplating it, a feeling of safety, safety in its ideals, its achievements, its discipline; the past had in some way the secret of eternal life, eternal values. By drawing the essence of classicism across the centuries, by as it were pickling the present in the past, both would survive. We get, therefore, a curious phenomenon: the preservation of a whole way of life in the present by transfusing it with the indestructable safety of an adored past. This aspect of 18th century civilization was far more apparent than the scientific or industrial revolutions, particularly to the schoolmasters and scholars who, at a remove, helped bring it about. To them, it was a great deal more "contemporary" to teach classics than, say, science or maths.
>
> This for the minority; but the majority gained even from the rudimentary classics that could be lashed into them. During the late 17th and 18th centuries, when most people were uneducated, an easy way to separate those who were educated was to have them speak Latin. If Latin, however imperfectly known, then became an essential qualification for the most desirable jobs in the land, and if Latin could only be obtained by being bought, then the rich could obtain those jobs because they were rich. The possession of the classics became a rude but definite class distinction. (p. 37.)

The importance of classics in the curriculum continued well into the nineteenth century:

> A cursory study of timetables, in 1805, say, or 1820, can often give an appearance of variety--French, German, Italian, Spanish, writing, dancing, drawing, fencing. It is an illusion. These were irrelevant frills....In 1840 anything from three-quarters to four-fifths of the time was spent on classics, forty hours a week....Nor will it occasion surprise to be told that class played a part, an overwhelming part, in their retention. Because gentlemen were supposed to be too rich to work the criticism that practically undiluted classics did not prepare someone to earn their living became a powerful recommendation. Some slight concession to necessity the upper-middle classes did allow: the army, navy, church, law and at the end of the century some of the professions (all if possible for younger sons). (p. 150.)

[125] Mary Martha Sherwood, The History of Henry Milner, a little boy who was not brought up according to the fashions

of this world, fifth edition (London: J. Hatchard and Son, 1835), pp. 161 - 162.

[126] Grierson, The Visit, pp. 45 - 46.

[127] Kilner, The Holiday Present, pp. 73 - 74.

[128] All these books except The Careful Parent's Gift are listed in the catalogue of the Osborne Collection of Early Children's Books.

[129] Sherwood, The Fairchild Family, pp. 163 - 164.

[130] Taylor, The Child's Birth-day, p. 68.

[131] Ibid., pp. 65 - 68.

[132] Sherwood, Soffrona and her Cat Muff, pp. 5 - 6.

[133] Ibid., p. 8.

[134] Sherwood, The Fairchild Family, p. 2.

[135] Hugh Cunningham, Leisure in the Industrial Revolution c. 1780 - 1880 (London: Croom Helm, 1980), p. 161.

[136] Sherwood, The Fairchild Family, p. 101.

[137] Barbara Hofland, The Good Grandmother, and her Offspring; a tale (London: Printed for R. Hunter, 1817), p. 20.

[138] Ibid., p. 25.

[139] Ibid.

[140] Ibid.

[141] Altick, The English Common Reader, p. 232.

[142] A Week at Christmas (Wellington, Salop,: F. Houlston and Son, 1829), p. 91.

[143] Taylor, The Child's Birth-day, pp. 65 - 66.

[144] Charles Lamb quoted in John Rowe Townsend, Written for Children (Penguin Books, 1977), p. 43.

[145] A Week at Christmas, p. 91.

[146] See Curtis, op. cit., pp. 738 - 739.

[147] See such recent historians of leisure and recreation as Robert W. Malcolmson op. cit., and James Walvin, Leisure and Society 1830 - 1950 (London: Longmans, 1978), and Philippe

Ariès's section "Games and Pastimes" in Centuries of Childhood. Ariès argues that in the past, "the society of old" when family life was less demanding and "work did not take up so much time during the day and have so much importance in the public mind...games and amusements extended far beyond the furtive moments we allow them." (pp. 72 - 73) In this society of old, characterized by greater sociability and communality than the more recent past and the present, "the same games were common to all ages and classes." (Ibid.) There seemed to be little point in introducing these arguments in detail in the text of this chapter because the literature neither supports nor disproves them. The literature and these arguments seem to exist on separate planes.

CHAPTER VI

CONCLUSION

CHAPTER VI

CONCLUSION

I. Introduction

By the middle of the nineteenth century, didactic literature had passed its peak. The didactic story was by no means finished, but new kinds of books were appearing. As John Rowe Townsend states in Written for Children, "There was a major breakthrough in children's literature in the middle of the century, after a hundred years or more of fitful and unspectacular progress."[1] Adventure stories, fairy tales, fantasies, romances, nonsense books, and domestic dramas appeared in great numbers. Some of the books of this period, particularly the domestic dramas,[2] retained some improving characteristics, but a great many did not. Some clearly were written for no other purpose than to entertain. Robert Louis Stevenson had nothing more in mind than "mere amusement" when he wrote Treasure Island (1883). As he described his progress to a friend in 1881:

> Will you be surprised to learn that it is about Buccaneers, that it begins in the "Admiral Benbow" public house on the Devon coast, that it is all about a map, and a treasure, and a mutiny, and a derelict ship, and a current, and a fine old Squire Trelawney, and a doctor, and another doctor, and a sea cook with one leg, and a sea-song with the chorus "Yo-ho-ho and a bottle of rum" (at the third Ho you heave at the capstan bars), which is a real buccaneer's song, only known to the crew of the late Captain Flint (died of rum at Key West,

> much regretted, friends will please accept this intimation)...That's the kind of man I am, blast your eyes....A chapter a day I mean to do; they are short. No women in the story...Its awful fun, boy's stories. You just indulge the pleasure of your heart, that's all; no trouble; no strain; no writing, just drive along as the words come![3]

There was little that was improving or instructive in this tale and much that would have shocked Mrs. Trimmer or Mrs. Sherwood. As Townsend writes, Stevenson "had jettisoned, without a thought, all the moral attitudes which previous writers for children thought it proper to maintain."[4]

The reasons for this breakthrough are complex and must ultimately relate to corresponding changes in nineteenth century society itself. Townsend suggests that "much can be attributed to the energetic and questing spirit of the time," and the growth of literacy. Adult literature too was in a "state of rapid development" and this was "echoed in children's books."[5] Publishing itself was becoming more respectable and as Richard D. Altick affirms in The English Common Reader, books were becoming cheaper and more readily available to all classes. Other factors are suggested by M. Nancy Cutt in Mrs. Sherwood and her Books for Children:

> By 1851, the year of Mrs. Sherwood's death, the children of the Evangelical ascendency had grown into the early Victorian reformers. Counterparts in real life of the little Fairchilds, of Henry Milner, little William... and Soffrona, they were heirs to the indestructable eighteenth-century moral tradition with its emphasis on benevolence, as well as the equally durable, highly concentrated Evangelical education that insisted upon vital religion, moral decision, and doing the right thing.
>
> No less religious than their parents, they had significantly shifted the premisses of belief. Many, in fact, rejecting their early Evangelicalism, turned to Liberal

> Christianity, to Tractarianism, to Roman Catholicism, or to free-thinking. Could they, the regenerated children of a world that had so recently established a rigid standard of respectability, be expected to acknowledge the universal depravity of mankind in general and their own wicked hearts in particular? The 'manners of the nation' had improved beyond all recognition. Whatever its actual spiritual state, by 1850, the nation complied outwardly to a greatly elevated moral standard; took missionary work for granted and paid for it; and hotly discouraged slavery anywhere in the world. As energetic and decisive as their parents, the Victorians sought and found their own causes: factory reforms, the health of towns, and the rehabilitation of the slum dwellers were among them. They had a profound faith in education; unlike the Evangelicals, who had seen ignorance as a lack of spiritual understanding, the Victorians saw it as a lack of practical knowledge as well, knowledge essential to human progress in the complex material world of the mid-century.
>
> As control of education shifted by degrees from the churches to the state, books for children became more secular--save for Sunday reading and books for the newly literate.[6]

Ultimately too, the change in literature reflected a change in the concept of childhood. With a relaxing of the Puritan belief in the depravity of childhood, children themselves came to be seen as entertaining and interesting in their own right, possessing innocent but profound wisdom of their own. The focus of children's literature shifted sharply from the adult perspective to that of the child. The child became the center of attention in a way he had not been before. In such well known works as The Princess and the Goblin by George MacDonald (1872), Alice in Wonderland by Lewis Carroll (1865), and Peter Pan by James Barrie (1911), children had greater sensibility and innate wisdom than adults, and in some cases even guided adults. The adults in some situations were reduced to a childlike condition, as in

MacDonald's The Princess and Curdie (1882) and Barrie's Peter Pan. Adult wisdom and behavior were openly criticized in Alice in Wonderland. But although these forms came to characterize later children's literature, traces or forerunners of them can be found in pre-Victorian didactic literature. There were many examples in didactic literature of children saving their families from destitution through their resourcefulness, and of adults being taught by children to amend their ways. And even though they could not be called innocent, Lucy, Emily, and Henry Fairchild had a certain interest and charm. These examples serve as a reminder that sweeping generalizations about the pre-Victorian family must be carefully examined.

While the evidence presented in the literature did demonstrate the dangers of generalizing too freely about the pre-Victorian family, as stated repeatedly in this thesis, this evidence cannot be accepted as an accurate representation of historical reality. Evidence in the literature cannot be used to support or reject modern theories about the family for the literature reflected the views of a particular part of society. But the literature can be used to illuminate and help explain aspects of pre-Victorian family life. And certainly, it can give the modern reader a sense of the period in a way no list of facts can do. Even a carefully constructed theory or interpretation fails to give that sense of immediacy.

II. Summary and Discussion

The discussion of the literature and the image of the family properly began in the second chapter with an examination of the structural features of the fictional family and the household composition. The total number of families included in the discussion was 119. They were found to be a homogeneous group in terms of social class and location of residence. Ninety-eight families belonged to the "comfortable classes," the upper and middle classes, and 97 families lived in rural surroundings, that is, on a country estate or farm or in a small village community.

The predominance of the comfortable classes and the preference for rural locations in the books and stories examined, accurately reflected certain characteristics of pre-Victorian society. In the first place, the comfortable classes were the classes that had the opportunity, money and leisure to both write and consume such literature. It is not surprising, therefore, that these classes predominated in the literature. And although it is commonly thought that the entire country underwent rapid industrialization in the early nineteenth century, as the historian G. Kitson Clark states, "Before 1851 it has been calculated that the majority of the population, even of England, lived in what could be called rural conditions."[7] Didactic children's literature illustrated a way of life that was still predominant in the early nineteenth century and it reminds us that "although the characteristic processes of the nineteenth century, the urbanization, the mechanization, the development of factories had begun...they had not penetrated as deeply into the life of the community as perhaps we are apt to think."[8]

Developments in domestic architecture have been seen by some historians as a reflection of corresponding developments in concepts of the family and childhood. Ariès and Stone, for example, write at length about the way in which the family home gradually lost its "public character" and rooms within the household lost their all-purpose function and became specialized, indicating a desire on the part of the family for privacy and isolation. According to Ariès, the lack of privacy in domestic dwellings in the past hindered the formation of concepts of the family. In the eighteenth century, he writes, "the family began to hold society at a distance, to push it back beyond a steadily extending zone of private life. The organization of the house altered in conformity with this new desire to keep the world at bay."[9] While there is evidence of room specialization and privacy in the literature, there is nothing to support, or for that matter disprove, theories relating specialization in domestic architecture to the development of concepts of the family and childhood. Details of domestic architecture were incidental and reflected economic status if anything. The house was simply a background for the more important concerns of the authors--moral education and internal family relationships. These concerns led them to devote more attention to the structural features of the family itself rather than domestic architecture.

Turning to the family itself, the mortality rates and average family size presented in the literature closely reflected the available historical data. With respect to the mortality rates, in 56 out of 119 families, one or both parents were dead or absent throughout all or the greater part of the story. Although not many adults or children actually died in the course of the stories, there were numerous references to deaths of siblings, relatives, servants, or acquaintances. Death was a familiar spectre in fictional families, and judging from the demographic data, in real families as well. Interestingly, this period of high death rates corresponded to a period in which affective relationships were becoming increasingly important. According to Ariès, deMause, and Stone, from at least the eighteenth century on, families were drawing closer together, forming tight emotional bonds, pushing away the greater community. Yet these high mortality rates, dutifully noted by historians of the family, may well have severely hindered the growth of affective ties. The question arises whether or not it was really possible to have such a thing as Stone's Closed Domesticated Nuclear Family when mortality rates were so high, first marriages were so short in duration, and remarriages so common. Moreover, the high incidence of parental mortality may have caused serious psychological trauma for the children. Unfortunately, historians have not given this question much serious consideration. The literature itself did not explain the consequences of such possible trauma, but countered family bereavement with exhortation to prayer, faith, and good deeds, seeking to provide comfort rather than explanation or understanding.

The average number of children per family in the literature was 2.89, a figure consistent with figures obtained by demographic historians. Peter Laslett, for example, states that there were between 2.5 and 3 children per family in this period of history.[10] Interestingly too, families presented in the literature were not of the large extended family type, thus complementing the most recent historical data. Laslett has remarked that the supposition that the family group in the pre-industrial world was large is "one of the most conspicuous of all the errors we seem to want to make about everyday life in the old world."[11] Contrary to popular wisdom, the family in the past was not large. It corresponded to what we have called the nuclear family, that is, parents and children. Few families in fact as well as in fiction supported relatives even before the Industrial Revolution. Mortality rates alone, which have been high until this century, precluded this. Yet so many historians of the family, even though they may refer to this evidence, continue to write about "the rise of the nuclear family."[12]

The average size of the fictional household, including parents, children and servants, was 5.45, a figure which corresponded closely to figures based on historical data. Laslett and Shorter give figures of 4.75 and 6.4 and 4.9 for specific English communities in this period of history. As stated above, the fact that the figures presented in the literature so closely resemble historical data is not surprising. Although the authors were concerned primarily with presenting to children moral and behavioral ideals, they realized that the effectiveness of their presentation would depend on the familiarity of the setting.

Because of their concern with moral and behavioral ideals, didactic authors devoted great attention to internal family relationships. It was important to establish the center of authority and influence in the story and to present the ideal relationship between the parents, parents and children, and siblings. Behavioral ideals, methods of discipline, rewards and punishments were given particular consideration.

The center of authority and influence in the pre-Victorian fictional family was the husband and father in the overwhelming majority of cases. Where the father was not the center of authority and influence, there was a well known and understood reason: absence, illness, or death. In these cases, the mother, an elder son, or a close male relative, depending on the circumstances, occupied the position. The father's position was unassailable because his authority stemmed from God. In a well known passage in Mrs. Sherwood's enormously popular and influential book, The History of the Fairchild Family, Mr. Fairchild told his small son, "I stand in the place of God to you." Although the mother shared some of this authority in her relationship with her children, she was herself in an inferior position with respect to her husband.

The stern, all-powerful father is a familiar figure in this period of history. Contemporary literature in fact has done much to color popular concepts of the nineteenth century paterfamilias. Few students of literature are unfamiliar with the characters of James Mill and Philip Gosse, immortalized by their famous sons in their autobiographies, or the fathers of Charlotte Brontë and John Ruskin, known to us through personal letters and diaries. As faithful as such representations may have been, given the emotional and psychological involvement of these eminent Victorians with their fathers, they have left us with a distorted or incomplete image. Didactic children's literature indicated that even though the husband and father's position was awesome, he was expected to use his position wisely and judiciously. In the ideal family, as presented by didactic authors, the tyrant was not admired. The paterfamilias, as Ann Taylor stated in The Family Mansion, should be "the tender guardian and solace of his family." "Domestic tyrants," she stated, "must never hope to experience the genuine pleasures and rational delights of a Family Mansion."[13] Lawrence Stone and other historians of the family have emphasized the power and authority of the paterfamilias, but have failed to note the gentler aspects of his character. The literature provided many examples of his tenderness toward his wife and children. Little Henry in The History of the Fairchild Family, while suffering under his father's wrath for refusing to learn his Latin, could still remember riding on his father's foot. And except in those few families which were deliberately presented as less than ideal, the wife and mother was treated with respect, tenderness, and even reverence. As a husband spoke of his wife to his daughter in Always Happy!!!, "She has a firm mind...which conquers self, and makes her feel only for others. Copy her fortitude, my dear child..."[14]

The dual nature of the ideal paterfamilias was further evident in patterns of discipline. Although authority, discipline, and obedience were emphasized in father-child relationships, few fathers demonstrated great brutality or hostility toward their children. There were very few incidents of violence or physical punishment in the literature.

The majority of fictional parents, and hence the ideal type, were considered paternalistic or maternalistic. These parents were characteristically authoritarian and in their relationships with their children, they gave love and support conditionally. That is, provided their children fulfilled certain conditions, such as demonstrating due docility, humility, obedience, and industry in their behavior, they would receive the benefits of parental love and support. Failure to live up to parental expectations would result in the immediate withdrawal of love and support. Although certain examples of withdrawal of love and support or psychological punishment made physical punishment seem more desirable, punishment was seldom prolonged when the recalcitrant child was seen to be sincerely penitent. Mr. Fairchild's wrath at Henry's refusal to learn Latin appears to be excessive to modern readers, yet as soon as he saw Henry was "humble," "it was no hard matter to get Mr. Fairchild to forgive Henry." "I freely forgive you my dear boy," said Mr. Fairchild.[15]

Mr. Fairchild was one of the best examples in the literature of the ideal pre-Victorian father type. He was a figure of authority, likening himself to God. He appeared to the child as all-powerful, all-knowing, awesome, remote, yet clearly capable of giving love and support when his conditions were met. It is significant that although Henry Fairchild and other children in the literature were afraid of their fathers, they also had very tender moments with them. Awesome and remote, strict and authoritarian the ideal paterfamilias had to be, yet he also had to combine these characteristics with tenderness, kindness, and lovingness. This point was emphasized in the marital relationship as well. The ideal fictional family was warm, loving, and supportive. Such closeness was illustrated in a tender scene in Maria Budden's Always Happy!!!:

> Serena threw herself into her /mamma's/ arms, and sobbed out her love,--her gratitude. Her parents tenderly embraced her--it was a happy scene, such as we all of us have in turn felt, but which we can never properly describe.[16]

It is interesting that the pre-Victorians did not consider sternness and tenderness incompatible in the same individual. But the reason for this juxtaposition seems clear. A capacity for tenderness was the key to the husband and father's control. His authority and position was infinitely strengthened if he could control his family through the basic human need for love and support. The paterfamilias could bind his dependents more closely to him by this means. He had to be able to give love and support and use them to engender love and respect for himself. An authority figure who has the love of his dependents as well as power over them is ultimately stronger and more influential than the one who has the power alone.

This association of sternness and tenderness in fictional family relationships seems to have reflected an actual characteristic of nineteenth century family relationships, for other forms of literary evidence such as letters, diaries, and autobiographies also suggest that there was probably a good deal more happiness and light in nineteenth century families than many historians have suggested. Stone, for example, describes the paterfamilias as "a severe and pitiless masculine figure," "directly controlling day-to-day events in the household" in his capacity as God's representative.[17] This image does not sit comfortably with the many pleasant family picnics, excursions, and birthday parties described in didactic literature. For all Mrs. Sherwood's moralizing, the image of the Fairchild family reading improving literature together in the Primrose Meadow is not unpleasant, and in fact has a certain charm. Fictional families, then, were close and supportive, ideal for the nurture of children, as many real families were, judging from contemporary literary sources. In some real families, however, this closeness may have become stifling. Edmund Gosse, Samuel Butler, and John Ruskin found them so. The ideal did not always bring happiness in the real world. But it would hardly be fair to use didactic children's literature to prove that nineteenth century families were "stifling fortresses of emotional bonding" for although the literature contains examples of what now may be seen as parental intrusiveness and psychological terrorism, there was little or no criticism of these practices in the literature itself. The families portrayed were by and large happy families. Happy families were of course not uncommon in the nineteenth century. The evidence available in didactic children's literature should caution family historians about generalizing too far on the themes of paternal authority and explosive intimacy.

Similarly, with respect to the concept of childhood depravity, there was less inflexibility and pessimism in outlook among didactic authors than Stone and others have suggested. The optimism and faith in the possibility of regeneration noted in so many books and stories indicates that not all pre-Victorians were completely convinced of the utter sinfulness and depravity of the child. Even Mrs. Sherwood's books did not appear to be consistent in this respect. As M. Nancy Cutt writes of one of Mrs. Sherwood's later books, Soffrona and her Cat Muff, "In ten years Mrs. Sherwood's vision of the child's world had undergone radical change....The world ...is more spacious and far happier."[18] Historians, then, have tended to generalize over the entire period, to dwell on passages proclaiming the sinfulness of the child and the necessity of breaking his will. Descriptions of children playing happily and innocently together, as may be found in Soffrona and her Cat Muff, are put aside.

Moreover, as noted above, there has been little attempt on the part of historians to explain or understand those child-rearing practices they condemn as so cruel, unreasonable, and even sadistic. They seem to ignore the high mortality rates they so dutifully include in their preliminary discussions of the family in past time, and fail to see a dreadful urgency behind certain methods of child-rearing reflected in didactic children's literature. If death is a very real spectre in families, if the chances of losing a child are very great, the chances are likewise great that the condition or state of the soul will be the primary concern of loving parents. It seems reasonable to assume that if parents were at all religious, and many feeling the effects of the Evangelical revival undoubtedly were even deeply religious, they would use any means they could to attain their ends, to wrest their children's souls from Satan and protect them from everlasting pain and misery. Pain in the present is nothing to pain that is everlasting. Many historians, it seems, have not taken into full account the force of vital religion in the early nineteenth century. However cruel and unreasonable some methods of child-rearing may seem today, it is clear that nineteenth century didactic authors intended their readers to see their ideal adults as loving parents, deeply concerned for the welfare of their children in this life and the next.

The closeness of relationships idealized in nineteenth century families has fostered the theory that the family sealed itself off from its traditional interaction with the surrounding world.[19] Ariès writes that "the family has advanced in proportion as sociability has retreated." Private life has been reinforced "at the expense of neighborly relationships, friendships, and traditional contacts....The history of modern manners can be reduced in part to this long effort to break away from a society whose pressure had become unbearable."[20] Many historians have taken up Ariès's theory that "sociability and the concept of the family were incompatible and could only develop at each other's expense."[21] Indeed, the general consensus seems to be that the development of the modern family required the pushing away of the community and the intensification of emotional relationships. So many historians of the family have referred to the family as isolated, and, like Ariès, have presented their interpretations of the pre-industrial family with a sense of regret. But, as noted above, their nostalgia may in fact derive from the Victorians themselves who idealized the past as they tried to cope with the confusion, instability, and insecurity of the industrial age. Didactic children's literature offers no evidence that early nineteenth century families were sealed off from the community and suffered physical and spiritual isolation.

In strictly physical and economic terms, the majority of fictional households were located in the community and the majority of fathers who were employed--a number had private incomes or fortunes--worked in the community well. As previously noted, pre-Victorian society, was predominantly rural and still relatively static. The physical conditions were ideal for close community relationships. However, because of the authors' concern with moral and religious development and behavioral ideals, less attention was given to community relationships than to internal family relationships. Even so, and perhaps because of this attention to moral and behavioral ideals, many fictional families were presented as having a highly developed sense of community responsibility. Religious considerations prevented the majority of respectable families from participating freely in parties, dances, balls, fairs, and similar community activities, but the majority of families were nonetheless very highly involved in community philanthropic activities such as visiting the poor, dispensing relief, and establishing schools. Philippe Ariès laments the decline of public amusements for "they formed one of the principal means employed by a society to draw its collective bonds closer together, to feel united,"[22] and fails to consider that religious and philanthropic activity may also bring a community together. The majority of fictional families attended church regularly, clearly believing in the value of community worship, and few families did not occasionally entertain visitors, friends, and neighbors from the community and outside. Few fictional families cut themselves off from the community, and significantly, those that did were not presented in a particularly favorable light. Thus even though internal relationships were emphasized in the literature, there was no evidence that families "sealed themselves off" from the community or that the family became, in Richard Sennett's phrase, "a refuge from the terrors of society."[23] While the community presented in the literature may well have reflected more stability than was actually present in early nineteenth century society, statements like Sennett's may suggest a confusion and dislocation greater than that which actually existed. If the community relationships may be too idealized in didactic children's literature, the terrors described by Sennett may be exaggerated.

As didactic children's literature reflected less of community relationships than we would like, so education and recreation suffered also due to the authors' preoccupation with religious, moral, and behavioral ideals. But education and recreation suffered only with respect to detail. For example, little information was provided about the organization of education in the early nineteenth century. Nothing of the early educational schemes, commissions, or acts is recorded. However, the authors devoted considerable attention to the requirements of a Christian education according to sex and social class. Similarly, although there was little detailed information about games and pastimes in the literature, the authors left no doubt about their attitudes toward recreation.

The pre-Victorians thought that there should be a relationship between education and recreation. They believed the lessons of the school room should not be forgotten in play, and therefore placed great emphasis on useful, instructive, and improving play. "Mere amusement" was frowned upon in all but a few cases. It was associated with frivolousness, a lack of seriousness and earnestness, and idleness. Idleness, of course, was associated with sin and depravity. As the Hervey children were told in Education at Home by Edgar White Benson, "idleness is the root of all evil." This idea, expressed so frequently in the literature, was a faithful reflection of nineteenth century attitudes. According to W. E. Houghton, "Except for 'God' the most popular word in the Victorian vocabulary must have been 'work.'"[24] Thomas Arnold wrote that "recreation is intended only 'to strengthen us for work to come,'" and Ruskin thought that "playful rest" was justified "during the reaction after hard labour, and quickened by satisfaction in the accomplished duty or perfected result."[25] Recreation then, was tied to the pattern of work. Work for upper and middle class children of course was diligent attention to their lessons.

Of all the subjects taught fictional children, religion was given the most emphasis. Religion consisted of study of the Scriptures, catechism, and learning hymns and prayers. But religion took up an even greater place in the curriculum than was formally allotted to it. Geography, history, and science lessons were infused with moral and religious instruction. Mr. Fairchild, for example, had no difficulty in combining geography and religion in the same lesson, and probably many nineteenth century parents did much the same thing, following the highly respected Mrs. Trimmer's observation that "Even Geography, Writing, and Arithmetic may be made, in some measure, subservient to religious instruction."[26]

The subjects taught reflected both sex and social class. Few girls in the literature received an education that included science, mathematics, and classics. This reflected nineteenth century concepts of woman's abilities and her proper sphere. Generally speaking, the education girls received in the nineteenth century was seriously inferior to that received by boys. The literature faithfully reflected the difference. With respect to the education of the poor, the most essential thing for them to learn was to read so that they could read their Bibles or the religious tracts and sermons that were distributed to them periodically by middle and upper class philanthropists. There was a prevalent belief that education should be appropriate to one's social station. Too much education for the poor (as indeed for women) was considered harmful, for it could lead to unrest and dissatisfaction. This belief, expressed repeatedly in didactic children's literature, can be considered an example of social control, but those who supported such a view were not exactly unreasonable or necessarily narrow-minded. At a time when many believed firmly in the divine ordering of society, when pathetically few were able to rise above their social class origins, it did seem cruelto some normally sensitive and humanitarian individuals to encourage the lower classes to aspire beyond their means and abilities. Nonetheless, great strides were made in the provision of education for the lower classes in the first part of the nineteenth century. Didactic children's literature, however, dealt only incidentally with lower class education.

The presentation of recreational activities in the literature was limited to lists of games, amusements, and toys. Rarely were details given of how a game might be played. Recreational activities, as already noted, were tied to patterns of work, both in fiction and in reality. Little attention was given to play in and for itself. The decline of traditional forms of recreation during the pre-Victorian period received almost no mention in the literature although Ariès and recent historians of leisure and recreation devote considerable attention to them in their works and lament their loss. The only traditional recreation noted in the literature was the popularity of animal blood sports noted in Mrs. Trimmer's Fabulous Histories.

The popularity of these pastimes were well on the decline in the pre-Victorian period, thanks to the efforts of individuals like Mrs. Trimmer and the Evangelical movement itself which encouraged the growth of humane societies. Few, if any, historians would seriously lament the decline of that particular amusement. The part that the Industrial Revolution played in the decline or the transformation of traditional forms of recreation was nowhere reflected in didactic children's literature.

Social class interests, which affected patterns of education and recreation were not discussed. Social class relationships throughout the literature were simplified. The upper classes had more material goods, more and better educational opportunities, and more opportunities in general than the lower class. But the upper classes were expected to use their wealth, position, and influence to remedy the deficiencies in the social and economic system. Didactic children's literature reflected a belief in an ideal, divinely ordered, stable world.

Didactic children's literature provides a unique way of looking at the pre-Victorian period. It highlights the attitudes, the ideals of an important and influential part of pre-Victorian society. By examining the ideals of a past society, even if the ideals are unrealistic or unfulfilled, historians can come closer to an understanding of that society and may well avoid some of the errors of oversimplification, overgeneralization, and presentism that chronically plague them.

As stated at the beginning of this thesis, it was not the purpose of this study to prove or disprove any theory of the history of the family or childhood, or indeed to offer another theory. Its purpose was to determine the image of the family presented in pre-Victorian didactic children's literature. Quite simply then, the ideal family was close, loving, and nurturing. The center of authority and influence was the father who, although given great power and authority by God, was expected to use that power wisely and carefully. The ideal father ruled his household through firmness and love.

His dependents were bound to him as much by ties of devotion, duty, and love as by fear. The ideal household was well ordered and everyone, adult and child, knew his duty and his place. The ideal family lived in fear of God and respect for His commandments. Details of child-rearing, education, and simple daily living were organized along religious and moral lines. Above all, harmony between all members of the family, adults and children, was to be striven for. Whatever the reality of domestic life might have been in this period, the fictional home reflected John Ruskin's image of the family as man's one sure refuge, the place of peace and love.

NOTES

[1] John Rowe Townsend, Written for Children (Penguin Books, 1977), p. 55.

[2] The best known of this genre is an American children's book, Little Women by Louisa May Alcott. It was popular in England as well as in America.

[3] Quoted in the introduction to the Penguin edition of Treasure Island (1977), p. viii.

[4] Towsend, op. cit., p. 64.

[5] Ibid., p. 55.

[6] M. Nancy Cutt, Mrs. Sherwood and her Books for Children (London: Oxford University Press, 1974), p. 96.

[7] G. Kitson Clark, The Making of Victorian England (London: Methuen, 1970), p. 69.

[8] Ibid., p. 118.

[9] Philippe Ariès, Centuries of Childhood. A Social History of Family Life (New York: Vintage Books, 1965), p. 398.

[10] Peter Laslett, The World We Have Lost (London: Methuen, 1979), p. 109.

[11] Ibid., p. 93.

[12] See for example Edward Shorter, The Making of the Modern Family (New York: Basic Books, 1977).

[13] Ann Taylor, The Family Mansion, A Tale (London: Taylor and Hessey, 1819), pp. 205 - 206.

[14] Maria E. Budden, Always Happy!!! or, the anecdotes of Felix and his sister Serena. A tale. Written for her children, by a mother (London: J. Harris, 1814), pp. 111 - 112.

[15] Mary Martha Sherwood, The History of the Fairchild Family (London: J. Hatchard and Son, 1818), pp. 270 - 271.

[16] Budden, Always Happy!!!, pp. 111 - 112.

[17] Lawrence Stone, The Family, Sex and Marriage in England 1500 - 1800 (New York: Harper and Row, 1977), p. 667.

[18] Cutt, op. cit., pp. 57 - 58.

[19] Shorter, op. cit., pp. 227 - 228.

[20] Ariès, op. cit., p. 406.

[21] Ibid.

[22] Ibid, pp. 72 - 73.

[23] Richard Sennett, The Fall of Public Man (New York: Vintage Books, 1978), p. 20.

[24] Walter E. Houghton, The Victorian Frame of Mind 1830 - 1870 (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1975), p. 243.

[25] Ibid.

[26] Quoted in From Instruction to Delight. An Anthology of Children's Literature to 1850 edited by Patricia Demers and Gordon Moyles (Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1982), p. 186.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources

I. Didactic Children's Literature

The Advantages of Education Elucidated, in the History of the Wingfield Family. London: Printed for J. Harris and Son, 1819.

Bayley, Diana. *Employment, the True Source of Happiness; or, the Good Uncle and Aunt*. London: John Harris, 1825.

------, *Improvement; or, a Visit to Grandmamma*. London: M. Arnold, 1832.

Beddoes, Thomas. *The History of Isaac Jenkins*. Dublin: Printed by R. D. Webb, 1831. First published in 1792.

Benson, Edward White. *Education at Home; or, a Father's Instructions: Consisting of Miscellaneous Pieces for the Instruction and Amusement of Young Persons from Ten to Twelve Years of Age*. London: Printed for Baldwin, Craddock and Joy, 1824.

Berquin, Arnaud. *The History of Jane and Eliza Wentworth*. London: T. Christie, 1829.

Bishop, James. *A Visit to the Farm*. London: Dean and Munday and A. K. Newman and Co., ca. 1835.

Budden, Maria E. (Halsey). *Always Happy!!! or, Anecdotes of Felix and His Sister Serena, by a Mother*. London: J. Harris, 1814.

------. *Claudine, or Humility, the Basis of all the Virtues*. London: J. Harris and Son, 1822.

------. *Nina, an Icelandic Tale. Written, for her Children, by a Mother*. London: Printed for Harris and Son, 1819.

------. *Right and Wrong. Exhibited in the History of Rosa and Agnes. Written, for her Children, by a Mother*. London: Printed for J. Harris, 1815.

Cameron, Lucy Lyttelton (Butt). *The Fruits of Education; or, the Two Guardians*. Wellington, Salop: Printed by and for Houlston and Son, 1827.

Cameron, Lucy Lyttelton (Butt). *The History of Little Frank and His Sister*. Fifth edition. London and Wellington, Salop: Printed for F. Houlston and Son, 1837.

------. *The History of Margaret Whyte; or, The Life and Death of a Good Child*. Wellington, Salop, and London: Printed by and for F. Houlston and Son, 1827.

------. *The Lost Child*. Sixth edition. Wellington, Salop: Printed by and for F. Houlston and Son, 1822.

------. *Memoirs of Emma and Her Nurse; or, The History of Lady Harewood*. London: Houlston and Son, 1825.

------. *The Sister's Friend; or, Christmas Holidays Spent at Home*. London: L. B. Seeley and Sons. 1831.

------. *Sophia; or, The Source and Benefit of Affliction*. Wellington, Salop: Printed by and for F. Houlston and Son, 1829.

------. *The Two Mothers; or, Memoirs of the Last Century*. Wellinton, Salop: Printed by and for F. Houlston and Son, 1824.

------. *The Willoughby Family*. Wellington, Salop: Printed by and for F. Houlston and Son, 1824.

Copley, Esther (Hewlett). *The Little Cowslip Gatherers; or, What a Penny Will Do*. London: William Darton, 1824.

Elliot, Mary (Belson). *Idle Ann, or, the Dunce Reclaimed*. London: William Darton, ca. 1820.

------. *The Little Mimic*. London: William Darton, 1825.

------. *The Little Wranglers*. London: William Darton, ca. 1825.

------. *The Orphan Brothers*. London: William Darton, 1825.

------. *Peggy and Her Mammy*. London: William Darton, 1819.

------. *The Rainy Day; or, The Pleasures of Employment*. London: William Darton, 1824?.

------. *The Truant Reclaimed*. London: William Darton, 1825.

------. *The Two Edwards; or, Pride and Prejudice Unmasked*. London: William Darton and Son, 1823.

Emily, A Tale for Young Persons. London: John Harris, 1825.

Emulation; or, The Way to be Great and Happy. London: Printed for Harvey and Darton, 1827.

The Factory Girl. London and Wellington, Salop: Printed for Houlston and Son, 1831.

Goody Two-Shoes; Exemplifying the Good Consequences of Early Attentions to Learning and Virtue. London: William Darton, ca. 1830.

Grierson, Miss. *The Visit, or Mamma and the Children*. Edinburgh: William Oliphant, 1824.

Harriet and Her Cousin; or, Prejudice Overcome. Second edition. Edinburgh: Thompsons, brothers. 1823.

The History of Little Lucy; or, the Birth-day Presents. London: Printed for J. Harris, 1819.

Hofland, Barbara (Wreaks) Hoole. *The Blind Farmer and His Children*. Second edition. London: Printed for Harris and Son, 1819.

------. *The Daughter-in-Law, Her Father, and Family*. London: A. K. Newman and Co., 1829.

------. *The Good Grandmother, and Her Offspring: A Tale*. London: Printed for R. Hunter, 1817.

------. *The History of a Merchant's Widow and Her Young Family*. London: A. K. Newman and Co., ca. 1825.

Horsley, Henry Sharpe. *The Affectionate Parent's Gift, and the Good Child's Reward*. London: Printed for T. Kelly by J. Rider, 1828.

Hughes, Mary (Robson). *A Mother's Care Rewarded; in the Correction of Those Defects Most General in Young People, During Their Education*. London: William Darton, 1824.

Jamieson, Frances (Thurtle). *Ashford Rectory; or, The Spoiled Child Reformed*. London: Printed for G. and W. B. Whittaker, and N. Hailes, 1820.

Janeway, James. *A Token For Children: Being An Exact Account of the Conversion, Holy and Exemplary Lives and Joyful Deaths of Several Young Children*. London: Printed for T. Norris, 1711?

Kennedy, Grace. *Anna Ross, A Story for Children*. Edinburgh: William Oliphant, 1824.

Kilner, Dorothy. *The Holiday Present; Containing Anecdotes of Mr. and Mrs. Jennet and Their Little Family....Interspersed with Instructive and Amusing Stories and Observations*. London: Printed for John Harris, 1831.

The Little Quaker; or, The Triumph of Virtue. A Tale for the Instruction of Youth. London: William Cole, ca. 1825.

Lucy Newton. Or, An Experiment in Education. London and Wellington, Salop: Printed for Houlston and Son, 1830.

Mamma's Stories, Read by Herself to Her Little Girl. London: Darton, Harvey and Darton, 1814.

Mant, Alicia Catherine. *Ellen, of The Young Godmother. A Tale for Youth*. Third edition. London: Printed for Law and Whittaker, 1815.

Marshall, Mrs. *The First Theft; A Tale*. London: John W. Parker, 1839.

Mary Campbell; or, The Affectionate Granddaughter. A Tale. Wellingon, Salop and London: Printed for Houlston and Son, 1828.

Maxwell, Caroline. *The Faithful Nurse; or, Fidelity Rewarded in the History of Master Simpson*. London: T. Hughes, 1829.

The Mirven Family; or, Christian Principle Developed in Early Age. London: Hamilton Adams and Co., 1825.

More, Hannah. *The Good Mother's Legacy*. London: Sold by J. E. Evans, J. Hatchard and Son, J. Nisbet, ca. 1830.

------. *The Shepherd of Salisbury Plain*. London: Sold by J. E. Evans, J. Hatchard and Son, J. Nisbet, ca. 1830.

More Minor Morals; or, An Introduction to the Winter Family: With Aunt Eleanor's Stories Interspersed. London: Printed for John Souter, 1821.

Motherless Mary; A Tale Shewing that Goodness even in Poverty is Sure of Meeting Its Proper Reward. London: Printed for J. Harris. 1816.

Orphan Rachel; or, Fruits of Perseverance. London: A. K. Newman, 1820.

Roche, Regina Maria (Dalton). *The Children of the Abbey, A Tale Adapted for Youth*. Glasgow: Printed for Richard Griffen and Co., 1826.

Richmond, Legh. *The Dairyman's Daughter, An Authentic Narrative*. London: Printed for and sold by W. Kent, ca. 1820.

Rodwell, Mary. *The Spoiled Child Reclaimed; or, The Advantages Arising from Good Instruction*. London: Chapman and Hall, 1835.

S., H. *Isabella; or, the Orphan Cousin. A Moral Story for Youth, by the Daughter of a Clergyman*. London: E. Edwards, 1825.

Sandham, Elizabeth. *The Adopted Daughter, A Tale for Young* Persons. London: Printed for J. Harris, 1815.

------. *The History of William Selwyn*. London: J. Harris, 1815.

Selwyn, A. *The History of Farmer Darwin and His Family. A Moral Tale*. London: Published by Dean and Munday, ca. 1825.

------. *Montague Park; or, Family Incidents*. London: William Cole, 1825.

Sherwood, Mary Martha (Butt). *The Happy Family*. London and Wellington: Printed for Houlston and Son, 1838.

------. *The History of Emily and Her Brothers*. Nineteenth edition. London and Wellington, Salop: Printed for Houlston and Son, 1837.

------. *The History of the Fairchild Family; or, The Children's Manual; Being a Collection of Stories Calculated to show the Importance and Effects of Religious Education*. London: J. Hatchard, 1818.

------. *The History of Little Henry and His Bearer*. Second edition. Wellington: Printed for and by F. Houlston and Son, 1815.

------. *The History of Henry Milner, a Little Boy, who was not brought up according to the Fashions of this World*. Fifth edition. London: J. Hatchard and Son, 1835.

------. *Home*. London. F. Houlston, 1828.

------. *The Little Woodman and His Dog Caesar*. Twelfth edition. Wellington, Salop: Printed by and for F. Houlston and Son, 1828.

------. *A Mother's Duty*. London: F. Houlston, 1820.

Sherwood, Mary Martha (Butt). *Soffrona and Her Cat Muff*. Wellington, Salop: Printed by and for F. Houlston and Son, 1828.

------. *Susannah; or, The Three Guardians*. London: Longman, Rees, Orme, Brown, and Green, 1827.

Sincerity: A Tale. London: Knight and Lacey, 1824.

Somerville, Elizabeth (Helme). *Flora; or, the Deserted Child*. London: Printed for J. Harris, 1811, ca. 1820.

------. *James Manners, Little John, and Their Dog Bluff*. London: Darton, Harvey, and Darton, 1818.

------. *Preludes to Knowledge; or, Amusing and Instructive Conversations on History, Astronomy, Geography, Optics, and the Division of Time and etc. Also Moral and Entertaining Stories*. London: Edward Lacey, ca. 1830.

Stoddart, Isabella (Moncrief Wellwood), Lady. *The Scottish Orphans. A Moral Tale; founded on Historical Fact and Calculated to Improve the Minds of Young People*. Second edition. London: W. Welton, 1823.

Sullivan, William Francis, translator. *Emily and Henrietta; or, A Cure for Idleness. An Improving Tale for Youth*. London: Dean and Munday, 1818.

Stubbs, Amelia. *Family Tales for Children*. London: William Darton, 1824.

Taylor, Ann (Martin). *The Family Mansion. A Tale*. London: Taylor and Hessey, 1819.

------, and Taylor, Jane. *Correspondence Between a Mother and Her Daughter at School*. London: Printed for Taylor and Hessey, 1817.

Taylor, Isaac. *The Child's Birth-day*. London: Darton, Harvey and Darton, 1815.

Traill, Catherine Parr (Strickland). *Happy Because Good; The Tame Pheasant, The Blind Brother and Kind Sister* (1830). London: Thomas Dean and Son, ca. 1855.

------, and Moodie, Susanna(Strickland). *Amendment; or, Charles Grant and His Sister*. London: A. K. Newman, 1828.

------, and Moodie, Susanna (Strickland). *The Little Prisoner; or, Passion and Patience*. London: A. K. Newman and Co., 1828.

Trimmer, Sarah (Kirby). *Fabulous Histories, Designed for the Instruction of Children, Respecting Their Treatment of Animals*. London: N. Hailes, 1818.

The Triumph of Good Nature, Exhibited in the History of Master Harry Fairborn and Master Trueworth. Insterspersed with Tales and Fables. Glasgow: J. Lumsden and Son, ca. 1815.

Tytler, Ann Fraser. *Mary and Florence; or, Grave and Gay*. Third edition. London: J. Hatchard and Son, 1837.

Ventum, Harriet (Crossley or Crosley). *The Good Aunt*. London: C. Chapple, 1813.

W., S. *The Warren Family; or, Scenes at Home*. London: James and Bain, 1814.

Watts, Isaac. *Divine Songs Attempted in Easy Language for the Use of Children*. Facsimile reproductions of the first edition of 1715 and an illustrated edition of circa 1840 with an introduction and bibliography by J. H. P. Pafford. London: Oxford University Press, 1971.

The Way to be Happy; or, The History of the Family at Smiledale. Glasgow: J. Lumsden and Son, 1819.

A Week at Christmas. Wellington, Salop: F. Houston and Son, 1829.

The West Indian; or, The Happy Effects of Diligence and Self-Control exemplified in the History of Philp Montague. Wellington, Salop: 1827.

What Trade Shall I Be? A Familiar Introduction to the Arts of Life and Society in the form of Dialogue. London: Edward Lacey, ca. 1830.

White, Eliza. *Gertrude; or, Thoughtlessness and Inattention Corrected. A Tale*. London: Printed for Harvey and Darton, 1823.

Wilson, Sarah (Atkins). *The Coral Necklace; Intended for the Amusement of Children*. London: Printed and sold by J. and C. Evans, ca. 1830.

The Winter Fire-side; or, Mrs. Franklin's Conversations with Her Children. London: Frederick Westley and A. H. Davis, 1828.

II. *Eighteenth and Nineteenth Literary Sources*

Barrie, James. *Peter Pan*. Penguin Books, 1977.

Brontë, Charlotte. *Jane Eyre*. New York: Scholastic Book Services, 1967.

------. *Villette*. Pan Books, 1973.

Buckler, William E., ed. *Prose of the Victorian Period*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1958.

Butler, Samuel. *The Way of All Flesh*. Penguin Books, 1977.

Burke, Edmund. *Reflections on the Revolution in France*. Indianapolis, Ind., Bobbs-Merrill, 1975.

Carlyle, Thomas. *Past and Present*. London: Dent, 1970.

Carroll, Lewis. *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland*. Penguin Books, 1975.

Darton, F. J. Harvey, ed. *The Life and Times of Mrs. Sherwood 1775 - 1851 from the Diaries of Captain and Mrs. Sherwood*. London: Wells Gardner, Darton and Co. Ltd., 1910.

Dickens, Charles. *Bleak House*. New York: W. W. Norton, 1977.

------. *Hard Times*. Penguin Books, 1977.

Elliot, George. *Middlemarch*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1968.

------. *The Mill on the Floss*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1961.

Gaskell, Elizabeth. *The Life of Charlotte Brontë*. Penguin Books, 1973.

Gosse, Edmund. *Father and Son*. Penguin Books, 1973.

Haight, Gordon S., ed. *The Portable Victorian Reader*. Penguin Books, 1972.

Houghton, Walter E. and Stange, G. Robert. *Victorian Poetry and Poetics*. Second edition. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1968.

Hughes, Thomas. *Tom Brown's Schooldays*. London: MacMillan, 1974.

Locke, John. *Some Thoughts Concerning Education*. Edited by Peter Gay. New York: Teachers College Press, 1971.

MacDonald, George. The Princess and Curdie. Penguin Books, 1982.

------. The Princess and the Goblin. Penguin Books, 1982.

Mill, John Stuart. Autobiography and other Writings. New York: Houghton Mifflin, 1969.

Rousseau, J. J. Émile. Translated by Barbara Foxley. London: Dent, 1977.

Stevenson, Robert Louis. Treasure Island. Penguin Books, 1977.

Ruskin, John. Praeterita. London: Oxford University Press, 1979.

Thackeray, William. Vanity Fair. Penguin Books, 1980.

Secondary Sources

I. History of the Family and Childhood

Anderson, Michael. Family Structure in Nineteenth Century Lancashire. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1971.

Ariès, Philippe. Centuries of Childhood. A Social History of Family Life. New York: Vintage Books, 1965.

------. "La Famille. A Report from France." Encounter, XL, V.2 (August, 1975) pp. 7 - 12.

Badinter, Elisabeth. Mother Love: Myth and Reality. Motherhood in Modern History. New York: MacMillan, 1981.

Beales, H. L. "The Victorian Family." Ideas and Beliefs of the Victorians: An Historic Revaluation of the Victorian Family. London: Sylvan Press, 1949, pp. 343 - 350.

Beekman, Daniel. The Mechanical Baby. A Popular History of the Theory and Practice of Child Raising. Westport, Conn.: Lawrence Hill and Co., 1977.

Burton, Elizabeth. The Early Victorians at Home, 1837 - 1861. London: Longmans, 1972.

Calder, Jennie. Women and Marriage in Victorian Fiction. New York: Oxford University Press, 1976.

Cleverly, John, and Phillips, D. C. From Locke to Spock. Carton: Melbourne University Press, 1976.

deMause, Lloyd, ed. The History of Childhood. New York: Harper and Row, 1974.

------. "The Independence of Psychohistory." History of Childhood Quarterly 3, Fall 1975.

------. "Our Forebears Made Childhood a Nightmare." Psychology Today, April 1975, pp. 85 - 88.

Demos, John. A Little Commonwealth. Family Life in Plymouth Colony. New York: Oxford University Press, 1970.

------. "Developmental Perspectives on the History of Childhood." Journal of Interdisciplinary History, 2 (1971), pp. 315 - 327.

Erikson, Erik. Childhood and Society. Second edition. New York: W. W. Norton, 1978.

"From Clan to Family. The Family, Sex and Marriage in England 1500 - 1800 by Lawrence Stone." The Economist, October 8, 1977, pp. 136 - 137.

Gathorne-Hardy, Johnathan. The Rise and Fall of the British Nanny. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1972.

Greenacre, Phyllis. The Quest for the Father. A Study of the Darwin-Butler Controversy, as a Contribution to the Understanding of the Creative Individual. New York: International Universities Press, 1963.

Greven, Philip J., ed. Child-Rearing Concepts, 1628 - 1861: Historical Sources. Ithasca, Ill: F. E. Peacock, 1973.

------. The Protestant Temperament. Patterns of Child-Rearing, Religious Experience, and the Self in Early America. New York: New American Library, 1979.

Harris, Barbara J. "Recent Work on the History of the Family: A Review Article." Feminist Studies, vol. 3, no. 3/4, Spring-Summer 1976, pp. 159 - 172.

Hoffman, Richard C. "The Family, Sex and Marriage in England 1500 - 1800." Library Journal, February 1, 1978, p. 364.

Hunt, David. Parents and Children in History. New York: Basic Books, 1970.

Illick, Joseph E. "Child-Rearing in Seventeenth Century England and America." In The History of Childhood, pp. 303 - 350. Edited by Lloyd deMause. New York: Harper and Row, 1975.

Jeffrey, Kirk. "Varieties of Family History." The American Archivist, 38 (1975), pp. 521 - 532.

Kern, Stephen. "Explosive Intimacy: Psychodynamics of the Victorian Family." History of Childhood Quarterly 1 (1974), pp. 437 - 461.

Kessen, William. The Child. New York: Wiley, 1965.

Lasch, Christopher. "The Family and History." The New York Review of Books, November 27, 1975, pp. 37 - 42, December 11, 1975, pp. 50 - 54.

------. "The Family, Sex and Marriage in England 1500 - 1800 by Lawrence Stone." The New Republic, July 8/15, 1978, pp. 34 - 37.

------. Haven in a Heartless World. The Family Beseiged. New York: Basic Books, 1979.

Laslett, Peter. "The Comparative History of the Household and Family." Journal of Social History 4 (1970), pp. 75 - 87.

Laslett, Peter, ed. Household and Family in Past Time. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1972.

------. The World We Have Lost. Second edition. London: Methuen, 1979.

Lockhead, Marion. The Victorian Household. London: John Murray, 1964.

Lopez, Manuel D. "A Guide to the Interdisciplinary Literature of the History of Childhood." History of Childhood Quarterly 1 (1974), pp. 463 - 494.

Milden, James Wallace. The Family in Past Time. A Guide to the Literature. New York: Garland Publishing Inc., 1977.

Miller, Peter J. "Early Nineteenth Century Concepts of Childhood." The Journal of Education 17, April 1971, pp. 21 - 38.

Moore, Katherine. Victorian Wives. London: Allison and Busby, 1974.

Morgan, Edmund S. The Puritan Family. Religion and Domestic Relations in Seventeenth Century New England. New edition. New York: Harper and Row, 1966.

Mousseau, Jacques. "The Family, Prison of Love. A Conversation with Phillip Ariès." Psychology Today, August 1975, pp. 51 - 58.

Pinchbeck, Ivy and Hewitt, Margaret. Children in English Society. Two volumes. London: Routledge and Keagan Paul, 1973.

Plumb, J. H. "The Great Change in Children." In Rethinking Childhood. Prespectives on Development and Society. Edited by Arlene Skolnick, pp. 204 - 213. Boston: Little Brown and Co., 1976.

------. "The New World of Children in Eighteenth Century England." Past and Present, no. 67 (1975), pp. 64 - 93.

------. "The Rise of Love. The Family, Sex and Marriage in England 1500 - 1800 by Lawrence Stone." The New York Review of Books, November 24, 1977, pp. 30, 35.

Robertson, Pricilla. "Home as a Nest: Middle Class Childhood in Nineteenth Century Europe." In The History of Childhood, pp. 407 - 431. Edited by Lloyd deMause. New York: Harper and Row, 1975.

Roe, Frederic Gordon. The Georgian Child. London: Phoenix House, 1961.

------. Victorian Child. London: Phoenix House, 1959.

Rosenberg, Charles E., ed. The Family in History. Philadelphia, Pa.: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1975.

Sangster, Paul. Pity My Simplicity. The Evangelical Revival and the Religious Education of Children 1738 - 1800. London: Epworth Press, 1963.

Saveth, Edward N. "The Problem of American Family History." American Quarterly 21 (1969), pp. 311 - 329.

Schnell, R. L. "History of Childhood as History of Education. A Review of Approaches and Sources." Alberta Journal of Educational Research 25 (September 1979), pp. 192 - 203.

Scott, Joan W. and Tilly, Louise A. "Women's Work and the Family in Nineteenth Century Europe." In The Family in History. Edited by Charles E. Rosenberg. Philadelphia, Pa.: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1975.

Shorter, Edward. The Making of the Modern Family. New York: Basic Books, 1977.

Skolnick, Arlene. "The Family Revisited: Themes in Recent Social Science Research." Journal of Interdisciplinary History 5 (1975), pp. 703 - 719.

Smith, Roger. "Early Victorian Household Structures: A Case Study of Nottinghamshire." International Review of Social History, vol. 15 (1970), pp. 69 - 84.

Sommerville, C. John. "Toward a History of Childhood and Youth." Journal of Interdisciplinary History 3 (1972), pp. 438 - 447.

Stone, Lawrence. The Family, Sex and Marriage in England 1500 - 1800. New York: Harper and Row, 1977.

-----. "The Massacre of the Innocents." The New York Review, November 14, 1974.

-----. "The Rise of the Nuclear Family in Early Modern England: The Patriarchal Stage." in The Family in History, pp. 13 - 57. Edited by Charles E. Rosenberg. Philadelphia, Pa.: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1975.

Taylor, Gordon Rattray. The Angel Makers. A Study in the Psychological Origins of Historical Change 1750 - 1850. New York: E. P. Dutton, 1974.

Tennant, D. F. "Anabaptist Theologies of Childhood and Education." The Baptist Quarterly, vol. xxix, no. 8 (October 1982), pp. 356 - 373.

Tranter, N. L. "The Social Structure of a Bedfordshire Parish in the Mid-Nineteenth Century. The Cardington Census Enumerators' Books, 1851." International Review of Social History, vol. 18 (1973), pp. 90 - 106.

Vicinus, Martha, ed. Suffer and Be Still: Women in the Victorian Age. Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Press, 1972.

Walvin, James. A Child's World. A Social History of English Childhood 1800 - 1914. Penguin Books, 1982.

Wishy, Bernard. The Child and the Republic. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1980.

Wohl, Anthony S., ed. The Victorian Family: Structure and Stresses. London: Croom Helm, 1978.

Wolf, Howard R. "British Fathers and Sons, 1773 - 1913: From Filial Submissiveness to Creativity." The Psychoanalytic Review, vol. 52 (Summer 1965), pp. 53 - 70.

Wrong, Dennis H. "An Account of the Evolution of Our Concept of Childhood." Books, vol. 208, no. 4 (April 1963), pp. 181 - 187.

II. Autobiographies and Biographies

Abse, Joan. John Ruskin. The Passionate Moralist. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1981.

Lane, Margaret. The Brontë Story. A Reconsideration of Mrs. Gaskell's Life of Charlotte Brontë. Fontana Books, 1979.

Longford, Elizabeth. Victoria R. I. London: Pan Books, 1976.

Mazlish, Bruce. James and John Stuart Mill: Father and Son in the Nineteenth Century. New York: Basic Books, 1975.

Peters, Margot. Unquiet Soul. A Biography of Charlotte Brontë. New York: Pocket Books, 1976.

Smith, Naomi Royde. The State of Mind of Mrs. Sherwood. London: MacMillan and Co. Ltd., 1946.

Woodham-Smith, Cecil. Queen Victoria: Her Life and Times. London: H. Hamilton, 1972.

III. History of Children's Literature

Altick, Richard D. The English Common Reader: A Social History of the Mass Reading Public. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1957.

Adams, Bess Porter. About Books and Children. Historical Survey of Children's Literature. New York: Holt, 1953.

Avery, Gillian. Childhood's Pattern: A Study of the Heroes and Heroines of Children's Fiction 1770 - 1950. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1975.

------. Nineteenth Century Children. Heroes and Heroines in English Children's Stories. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1965.

------. Victorian People in Life and Literature. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1970.

Barry, Florence V. A Century of Children's Books. New York: Geroge H. Doran Company, 1923.

Bettelheim, Bruno. The Uses of Enchantment. The Meaning and Importance of Fairy Tales. New York: Random House, 1977.

Bingham, Jane, and Scholt, Grayce. Fifteen Centuries of Children's Literature. An Annotated Chronology of British and American Works in Historical Context. Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 1980.

Buckley, Jerome, ed. The Worlds of Victorian Fiction. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1975.

Coveney, Peter. Poor Monkey. The Child in Literature. London: Barrie and Rockliff, 1957.

Crandall, J. C. "Patriotism and Humanitarian Reform in Children's Literature 1825 - 1860." American Quarterly 21 (1969), pp. 3 - 22.

Cruse, Amy. The Englishman and His Books in the Early Nineteenth Century. London: George G. Harrap and Co., 1930.

------. The Victorians and Their Reading. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, n.d.

Cutt, M. Nancy. Ministering Angels. Published for the Friends of the Osborne and Lillian H. Smith Collections, Toronto Public Library by Five Owls Press, Ltd., Wormley Broxbourne, Herts., England, 1979.

------. Mrs. Sherwood and Her Books for Children. London: University of Oxford Press, 1974.

Darton, Frederick Joseph Harvey. Children's Books in England: Five Centuries of Social Life. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1958.

Demers, Patricia, and Moyles, Gordon, eds. From Instruction to Delight. An Anthology of Children's Literature to 1850. Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1982.

De Vries, Leonard, ed. Flowers of Delight. London: Dennis Dobson, 1965.

Duffy, Mareen. The Erotic World of Faery. New York: Avon Books, 1980.

Egoff, Sheila V., comp. Only Connect: Readings on Children's Literature. Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1969.

Ellis, Alec. A History of Children's Reading and Literature. Oxford: Pergamon Press, 1968.

Field, E. M. The Child and His Book. Some Account of the History and Progress of Literature in England. Second edition. London: 1892.

Gottlieb, Gerald. Early Children's Books and Their Illustration. New York: Pierpoint Morgan Library, 1975.

Green, Roger Lancelyn. Tellers of Tales; Children's Books from 1800 - 1964. London: Kaye and Ward, 1969.

Grylls, David. Guardians and Angels: Parents and Children in Nineteenth Century Literature. London: Faber and Faber, 1978.

Haviland, Virginia. Children's Literature: A Guide to Reference Sources. Washington: Library of Congress, 1966.

Hazard, Paul. Books, Children, and Men. Translated by Marguerite Mitchell. Fourth edition. Boston: Horn Book, 1960.

James, Philip. Children's Books of Yesterday. London: The Studio Ltd., 1933.

Kiefer, Monica. American Children Through Their Books 1700 - 1835. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1948.

Lockhead, Marion. The Renaissance of Wonder in Children's Literature. Edinburgh: Canongate, 1977.

Lystad, Mary. From Dr. Mather to Dr. Seuss. Two Hundred Years of American Books for Children. Cambridge, Mass.: Schenkman Publishing Co. 1980.

MacLeod, Anne Scott. A Moral Tale. Children's Fiction and American Culture 1820 - 1860. Hamden Conn.: Archon Books, 1975.

Muir, Percy. English Children's Books 1600 - 1900. London: B. T. Batsford Ltd., 1969.

Osborne, Edgar. A Token for Friends. Toronto: Toronto Public Library, 1979.

Palmer, Denise. Attitudes Toward the Pursuit of Games and Pastimes in Childhood, as Portrayed by the Authors of Children's Literature 1780 - 1855. Ph. D. Thesis, University of Alberta, 1977.

Pickering, Samuel F., Jr. John Locke and Children's Books in Eighteenth-Century England. Knoxville, Tennessee: The University of Tennessee Press, 1981.

Smith, Lillian H. The Unreluctant Years. A Critical Approach to Children's Literature. Penguin Books, 1976.

Sommerville, C. John. "Breaking the Icon: The First Real Children in English Books." History of Education Quarterly, vol. 21, no. 1 (Spring 1981), pp. 51 - 75.

Toronto Public Library. The Osborne Collection of Early Children's Books 1566 - 1910. A Catalogue. Prepared at Boys and Girls House by Judith St. John with an introduction by Edgar Osborne. Toronto: Toronto Public Library 1958 - .

Townsend, John Rowe. Written For Children: An Outline of English Children's Literature. Penguin Books, 1977.

Tuer, Andrew White. Pages and Pictures From Forgotten Children's Books. New York: B. Blom, 1968.

Thwaite, Mary Florence. From Primer to Pleasure. An Introduction to the History of Children's Books in England, from the Invention of Printing to 1900. London: Library Association, 1963.

University of Calgary Department of English. Selections From Children's Literature in England 1200 - 1900. The University of Calgary, 1982.

Walsh, William. The Use of Imagination. Penguin Books, 1966.

Wolff, Robert Lee. Gains and Losses: Novels of Faith and Doubt in Victorian England. New York: Garland Publishing Co., 1977.

IV. Eighteenth and Nineteenth Century Histories

Altick, Richard D. Victorian People and Ideas. New York: W. W. Norton and Co. Inc., 1973.

Armytage, W. H. G. Four Hundred Years of English Education. Second edition. Cambridge: University Press, 1970.

Bradley, Ian C. The Call To Seriousness. The Evangelical Impact on the Victorians. New York: MacMillan, 1976.

Briggs, Asa. Victorian People. Penguin Books, 1967.

British Broadcasting Commission. Ideas and Beliefs of the Victorians. An Historic Revaluation of the Victorian Age. London: Sylvan Press, 1949.

Castle, E. B. Educating the Good Man. Moral Education in Christian Times. New York: Collier Books, 1962.

Clark, G. Kitson. The Making of Victorian England. London: Methuen, 1970.

Crane, R. S. Critical and Historical Principles of Literary History. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1971.

Cunningham, Hugh. Leisure in the Industrial Revolution 1780 - 1880. London: Croom Helm, 1980.

Curtis, S. J. History of Education in Britain. Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 1971.

Deane, Phyllis. The First Industrial Revolution. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1975.

Gathorne-Hardy, Johnathan. The Public School Phenomenon 597 - 1977. Penguin Books, 1977.

Halévy, Elie. A History of the English People in the Nineteenth Century. New York: Barnes and Noble, 1961.

Harrison, J. F. C. Early Victorian Britain 1832 - 51. London: Collins, 1979.

Houghton, Walter E. The Victorian Frame of Mind 1830 - 1870. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1975.

Huizinga, Johan. Homo Ludens. A Study of the Play Element in Culture. Boston: Beacon Press, 1967.

Jaeger, M. Before Victoria: Changing Standards and Behavior 1787 - 1837: London: Chatto and Windus, 1956.

Jarrett, Dereck. England in the Age of Hogarth. St. Albans: Paladin Frogmore, 1976.

Kellett, E. E. Religion and Life in the Early Victorian Age. London: The Epworth Press, 1938.

Lawson, John, and Silver, Harold. A Social History of Education in England. London: Methuen, 1973.

Malcolmson, Robert W. Popular Recreation in English Society 1700 - 1850. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1973.

Moraze, Charles. The Triumph of the Middle Classes. Translated by George Wiedenfeld and Nicholson Ltd. New York: Anchor Books, 1968.

Newsome, David. Godliness and Good Learning. London: John Murray, 1961.

Quinlan, Maurice J. Victorian Prelude. A History of English Manners 1700 - 1830. Hamden, Conn.: Archon Books, 1965.

Reisman, David. The Lonely Crowd. A Study of the Changing American Character. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1980.

Russell, G. W. E. The Household of Faith. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1902.

Sandiford, Keith. "The Victorians at Play: Problems in Historical Methodology." Journal of Social History, vol. 15, no. 2 (Winter 1981), pp. 271 - 288.

Sennett, Richard. Authority. New York: Vintage Books, 1981.

------. The Fall of Public Man. New York: Vintage Books, 1978.

------, ed. The Psychology of Society. An Anthology of Classic Writings on the Basic Issues, Developmental Concepts, and Leading Theories of Social Psychology. New York: Random House, 1977.

Simon, Brian. Studies in the History of Education 1780 - 1870. London: Lawrence and Wishart, 1960.

Somervell, D. C. English Thought in the Nineteenth Century. Sixth edition. London: Methuen, 1950.

Stewart, W. A. C., and McCann W. P. The Educational Innovators, 1750 - 1880. London: MacMillan, 1967.

Thompson, E. P. The Making of the English Working Class. Penguin Books, 1976.

Thomson, David. England in the Nineteenth Century. Penguin Books, 1975.

Walvin, James. Leisure and Society 1830 - 1950. London: Longman, 1978.

Willey, Basil. Nineteenth Century Studies. Penguin Books, 1973.

Williams, Raymond. Culture and Society 1780 - 1950. Penguin Books, 1977.

Wingfield-Stratford, Esmé. Those Earnest Victorians. London: Routledge, 1930.

Young, G. M. Portrait of an Age. Victorian England. Second edition. London: Oxford University Press, 1977.